INTERLINGUAL COGNIZANCE OF METAPHORS: A CASE STUDY OF SELECTED EXPERIENTIAL DOMAINS OF ENGLISH AND LUGANDA

BY

FRANCIS JJEMBA

2008/HD03/11933U

BA, B.TH, LLB, DIP.LEGAL PRACTICE, PoDITRA, PGDE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS (LINGUISTICS) OF MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

JULY, 2019

DECLARATION

This is to declare most solemnly, that, this Dissertation Report is my original work and to the best of my knowledge, has never been submitted to any university or institution for the award of a degree or presented for publication in any part of the world.

Signature..

FRANCIS JJEMBA

Researcher

Date..10th December 2020.

APPROVAL

This is to certify that this Dissertation Report whose title is "INTERLINGUAL COGNISANCE OF METAPHORS: A CASE STUDY OF SELECTED EXPERIENTIAL DOMAINS OF ENGLISH AND LUGANDA" by FRANCIS JJEMBA was done under my supervision.

Signature...

DR. MERIT KABUGO

Supervisor

Date....13/04/2022...............

ii

DEDICATION

To precious mum, C h r i s t i n e, your perpetual absence makes your presence more real in its unreality-my heroine,you are unforgettable! And to my one and only wife, Jassy Jjemba,thanks for every support.It is that way about you that echoes the best that you are!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

NCDC: National Curriculum Development Centre

UNEB: Uganda National Examinations Board

"O" Level: Ordinary Level

"A" Level: Advanced Level

ELT   English Language Teaching

L1   First Language

L2   Second Language

ABSTRACT

Metaphor is a tool so ordinary that we use it unconsciously and automatically, with so little effort that we hardly notice it. It is omnipresent: metaphor suffuses our thoughts no matter what we are thinking about; It is accessible to everyone: as children, we automatically, as a matter of course, acquire a mastery of everyday metaphor. Accordingly, the purpose of this report was to study the interlingual cognizance, translatability and how a bilingual's communicative competence can be enhanced in the interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse.

The study was conducted in 14 public secondary schools in Busiro County Wakiso District and the study population constituted lower secondary school teachers of English, English and Luganda and Luganda only. From a population of 85 teachers, a sample size of 70 participants was randomly selected. In order to achieve the study objectives, the test was the research instrument that was employed in data collection. The main statistical procedures employed in this study were a t-test and ANOVA.

The findings indicated that the degree of interlingual cognizance of metaphors is significantly dependent on the teachers' first language (L1). Specifically, English as a first language was found to have a high degree of influence on teachers' cognizance of metaphors in discourse used in English and Luganda. However, L1 had no statistically significant influence in explaining teachers' translatability of metaphors. The findings however revealed differences in the average scores obtained between the two parties: each party translated better the metaphors that originated in or caused by their L1s and the amount of variation was quite substantial within both groups. Lastly, in relation to enhancement measures of metaphors in discourse, the study failed to find any significant effect of the L1 on teachers' use of metaphors. Based on these findings, recommendations were made key among these is that attempts should be made that the English and Luganda taught in schools are more relevant to the learners' intercultural communicative challenges.

DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

The following terms have been used in this study with the following operational definitions:

1. Culture: The integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief and behaviour that depends upon the capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations; the customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious or social group; the set of shared attitudes, values, goals and practices that characterize an institution or organization; the set values, conventions or social practices associated with a particular field, activity or societal characteristic (Cross, Bazron, Dennis & Isaacs, 1989).

2. Context: The general situation or circumstance in which an utterance happens, which helps to explain it (Stalnaker, 1999).

3. Ekimiimo eky'awamu (metaphor): a word or phrase that means one thing and is used for referring to another thing in order to emphasize their similar qualities (merriam-webster.com/dictionary).

4. Thematic curriculum: Curriculum dimension in primary schools that addresses the learning experiences of pupils basing on themes.

5. Proverb: A short saying commonly used, usually pertaining to advice on how to conduct one's life (Taylor,1931).

6. L1: Speaker's first language

7. L2: Speaker's second language

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction

In the field of language and literature, the use of metaphor as a rhetorical device has long been recognized by scholars and researchers. Studies on metaphors can be traced back to the time of ancient Greece. Once considered a stylistic issue, metaphor is now considered a critical component of everyday and specialized language and most importantly, a fundamental mechanism of human conceptualizations of the world (Hoang, 2014).

According to (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another. Metaphorical use of language is so widespread in our daily life activities that it is almost impossible to do without this figurative language device. For example, by reading some few lines of a written discourse or a news item, a metaphorically competent reader is able to identify the abundant use of metaphorical language. For this reason, acquiring metaphoric competence plays a significant role in language learning (Littlemore & Low, 2006). (Moser, 2000) asserts that metaphor analysis is useful for accessing tacit knowledge and exploring social and cultural processes of understanding. In their submission, (Bullough & Gitlin, 1995) stressed the power of metaphor analysis to provide insight into assumptions that characterize a concept and drive action (Bullough, 1991). Given that metaphor is of the essence, there has been a vast body of research on figurative language for example; Csábi, 2004; Turner, 1991; Butzkamm, 2003; Zheng & Song, 2010.

According to Yan , 2015, the term metaphor is derived from two ancient Greek words 'meta' and 'pherein' which mean 'across' and 'change' respectively. This implies that the basic function of metaphor is to transform something from one place to another. More than two thousand years ago, Aristotle wrote down the first definition of metaphor in his works, which opened formal studies about the metaphor. He believed that the function of the metaphor was primarily decorative and ornamental.

In the traditional view, metaphor is a matter of special language, which is called a figure of speech. As a result, for hundreds of years, most metaphor studies focused on a rhetorical perspective. However, the 20th century witnessed a great boom in the study of metaphor. During this period, the view of the metaphor changed from a purely figurative device to a matter of thought itself. (Lakoff, 1986) points out that metaphor is not just a way of naming, but also a way of thinking and it is a figure of thought.

Nowadays, the interest in the study of metaphor has expanded to cover a broad range of areas, including the interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse, the mechanism, function of metaphors and its effects in the fields of linguistics, anthropology, philosophy, psychology, educational sciences as well as literary criticism and rhetoric. (Littlemore, 2001) reports that on average, English-speaking people use over 3000 metaphors weekly. He however, notes a discrepancy between the uses of the native and foreign language speakers in terms of metaphoric expressions. For example, as the native speakers use their automated pragmatic experiences in their communication, they cannot make a distinction between metaphoric and denotative meaning of a word. In the field of education, when learners of the second language are confronted with the meanings of a word, they are unfamiliar with, they have an inclination to refer first to the denotative meanings of

words out of the knowledge they constructed while at the point of learning that language (Charteris-Black, 2002).

Language is part of culture and for that reason; the cross cultural study of metaphor requires a deep understanding of cultures under study as (Tylor, 1873) stipulates in his book "primitive culture". In his definition (Smith, 2001) views culture as that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. According to (Lustig& Koester, 2003) culture is a learned set of shared interpretations about beliefs, values, and norms, which affect the behaviors of a relatively large group of people. Similarly, (Samovar & Porter, 1991) look at culture as a medium that touches and alters all aspects of human life, including personality, how people express themselves (which includes displays of emotion), the way they think, how they move, and how problems are solved. Culture covers a huge range of areas and many fields still need to be explored including the interlingual cognizance of metaphor. On the other hand, as a significant part of foreign language teaching and learning, the interlingual cognizance of metaphor will attract the interest of a number of applied linguists. (Low, 1988) argues that interlingual metaphoric cognizance should be developed in language learners. (Deignan, 1997) also considers that interlingual metaphoric cognizance consists of metaphoric awareness and strategies for comprehending and creating metaphors.

In multilingual and multicultural environments like Uganda, a unique opportunity is provided for studying culture in its varied intralingual and interlingual forms, aspects of the structure and use of language that demonstrate interlingual cognizance of metaphors. The term multilingualism covers a range of meanings. In the past, most studies have concentrated on learning of a second language or bilingualism. Both

terms are still used as cover terms for multilingualism. Apart from (Braun, 1937), this attitude was also expressed in Haugen's pioneering work on multilingualism when he subsumed multilingualism under bilingualism and suggested that bilingual includes plurilingual and polyglot (Haugen, 1956). In contrast, in more recent research looking beyond the study of two languages, bilingualism is treated as a variant of multilingualism (Herdina & Jessner, 2002). As a consequence, multilingualism is only used to refer to the learning of more than two languages. Yet, a dynamic systems approach to multilingualism makes it possible to integrate both viewpoints. For example, by virtue of the fact that Luganda and English co-exist in central Uganda, the former being considered by majority of the population as their first language and the latter taken as a second language, the following questions may be asked:

i. In what ways are English and Luganda similar in cultural motivation underpinning metaphors?

ii. Do the speakers of both languages have equal familiarity as far as the cognizance of metaphors in either language is concerned?

iii. What can the speakers of both languages do to increase their metaphorical cognizance?

1.1 Background to the study

Culture is one of the most complicated words in the English language and has come to be used for important concepts in several distinct systems of thought as (Williams, 1976) indicates. Over the years, there have been numerous definitions of culture provided by popular academic sources. As in the record of the (New Encyclopedia Britannica, 1985), the 164 definitions of culture include, learned behavior; ideas in the mind, a logical construct, a statistical fiction, a psychic defense mechanism. In recent

yrs, the definition of culture that is preferred by many anthropologists is that culture is an abstraction from behavior, (ibid). Generally, culture consists of a variety of things, including language, ideas, beliefs, customs, codes, institutions, tools, techniques, and works of art. Cultural models are a great variety of human institutions that are the projections of conventional understandings of reality set in time and space, for all to experience as artifacts of a community's life (Shore, 1996). For example public models may be created to describe palpable entities such as houses, pottery, tools, paintings, songs, dances, and types of clothing which are all in the realm of material culture in the world. On the other hand, some impalpable cultural models, like conventional styles of movement and speech, exist in the minds of people. In that case culture can be defined as an extensive collection of different models that exist both as public artifacts in the world and as cognitive constructs in the minds of members of a community (ibid).

As an important part of culture, most conventional models are passed on over time through generations. In addition, image schemas that relate to culture are used widely in conceptual metaphor. Image schemas are schematic images such as trajectories or length in shapes or containers, (Lakoff, 1987). (Johnson, 1987) considers them as structures for organizing our experience and comprehension. Most image schemas are derived from somatic experience such as up-down schemas, centre-periphery schemas and container schemas.

With respect to the study of interlingual cognizance of metaphors between English and Luganda, those cultural models and experiences in the minds of the speakers of both English and Luganda have to be emphasized. Interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse has a tight relationship with thought, human, cultural and conceptual systems. Consider the conventional models, they are stocked in our minds

and are shared with members in the same speech community; for example the custom of removing a hat when saying 'hello' in western countries. These models exist in a certain social environment as opposed to personal models, which are named idiosyncratic models (ibid).

1.1.1 Concepts governing our thoughts

The concepts that govern our thoughts are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. (Austin,1962) notes that our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people.Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities.

"If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do everyday is very much a matter of the metaphor. But our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware of. In most of the things we do everyday, we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines. Just what these lines are is by no means obvious. One way to find out is by looking at language" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980,p.124).
 In fact (Bates, Devescovi & Wulfeck, 2001) emphasize that since communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting, language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like.

"The problem of what metaphor is and what it does has been a hot topic of discussion since ancient times. Aristotle wrote that the use of metaphor was a true mark of

brilliance, and the one thing that cannot be taught about poetry (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.124)".

This therefore presupposes that mastery of metaphorical use in discourse is a clear illustration of fluent linguistic expression. This however is an art just as playing a guitar or drawing a portrait is, we admire it only when it is done too well. This statement corroborates the fact that a good communicator requires to have learnt certain skills and this is completely a linguistic phenomenon. Effective communication, smooth flow of thought and ideas are linguistic paradigms that flourish on language competence.

1.1.2 The use of rhetoric in communication

Use of rhetoric in communication is an important aspect of style that decorates one's discourse with very colourful expressions and this linguistic flare and flavour are the flowers that give birth to fruits evidenced in the freshness of ideas, aesthetic and beauty aspects of language: putting words together in such a way as to convey meaning easily and clearly. Decency may be regarded as the manners of discourse and the same relations to speaking and writing table manners have to eating. It is a point to note that mutual comprehension of metaphors to the speakers of both English and Luganda remains a grey area whose causes ought to be investigated.

Metaphorical expression in language is "the palm oil with which words are eaten" (Achebe, 1958,p.7). (The Longman Dictionary of Poetic Terms, 1989), maintains that, "a metaphor enhances and deepens meaning in the act of communication".

The above statement postulates the fact that metaphorical use in language shows depth of knowledge and the degree of formal exposure one has towards that language in question.

In Uganda, the speakers of English and Luganda unconsciously or consciously use metaphorical expressions though the question of their mutual use becomes very interesting and really motivates careful investigation. Indeed, a lot of metaphors are unconsciously used. Therefore a linguistic survey aiming at establishing an interlingual cognizance of metaphors in both English and Luganda discourse is a study worth undertaking.

(Harold, 1964) acknowledges the English language as the international lingua franca – a language of trade and wider communication. Uganda adopted English as the second language and the medium of official communication. Therefore, there is need for the population to master this language in a bid to create perfect bilinguals for effective communication. Effective communication does not only need knowledge of the formal structure of language but also some of its stylistic aspects. This study will investigate the use and cognizance of metaphors in discourse in both English and Luganda languages – the two languages widely spoken in the central region of Uganda.

1.1.3 Metaphors and culture

Metaphors are deeply rooted into culture. An interlingual comparison of metaphors across cultures therefore, necessitates one to know the cultures under study because, for example, metaphors of the English language are given in English and draw on English cultural imagery and so do those of Luganda. A true bilingual must learn the two cultures of both English and Luganda languages and should be able to differentiate them without mixing them up. Certainly important, is the fact that one's

comprehension of a metaphorical expression is drawn from the deep structures not surface structures because metaphors have both surface and deeper meanings.

Through metaphors, we are able to conceive one thing in terms of another, and its primary function is understanding as (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) contend. That is, we often do and must talk about things that do not physically exist, that we cannot reach out and touch or take apart with our hands to see what is inside and how it works. Such things include: love, time, anger, life and so forth. Sometimes these intangibles are emotions (love, anger); sometimes they are abstractions or names for a whole range of things or activities (argument, friendship). We make them tangible by, in a process of thought, applying models of physical things to them: love is falling; argument is war. Thus, difficulties confronted lie in the different cultural background shared by the source language's writers and the target language's readers. In fact, most obstacles can be traced back to the culture clash. Therefore, metaphors are stamped with the culture of society, which have great impacts on every aspect of people's life.

The use of metaphorical expressions in communication is inherent and, therefore, linguistically inevitable. It traverses all languages throughout the world. (Nordquist, 2009) argues that some people think of metaphors as nothing more than the sweet stuff of songs and poems – love is a jewel or a rose or a butterfly; but in fact all of us speak and write and think in metaphors everyday. They cannot be avoided; metaphors are built right into our language. Such a statement avers the truth that metaphors are not simply literary devices but something quite active in understanding perhaps even the very basis of language. This current study is based on the assumption that mastery of metaphorical expressions in a language is directly proportional to the amount of

exposure an individual has to that language. This exposure is, however, culturally motivated and is different basing on one's degree cultural exposure. The magnitude and scope of metaphor command an individual may have in the English language may be far different from that which the same individual may have in Luganda and vice versa. This will resultantly have a functional relationship with the perception and use of metaphors from one language to the other.

Those who have mastered the art of creative communication impress their audiences easily due to appropriate use of language. Therefore, an interlingual study of the cognizance of metaphors of the selected experiential domains of English and Luganda languages is worth being undertaken in order to expound more on this figurative language use.

1.1.4 English use in Uganda

Uganda has opted for English as its official language and it is a subject on the checklist of NCDC and is examined by UNEB at primary and secondary levels (particularly "O"level). English is a second language in Uganda. On the other hand, Luganda is L1 to a significant proportion of the population in central Uganda. While commenting on L1, (Butzkamm, 2003) stated that usingL1, we have (1) learnt to think, (2) learnt to communicate and (3) acquired an intuitive understanding of grammar. L1 is therefore the greatest asset people bring to the task of foreign language learning and provides a Language Acquisition Support System. It opens the door, not only to its own grammar, but to all grammars, inasmuch as it awakens the potential for universal grammar that lies within all of us. For this reason (Butzkamm,1962:48) considers "L1 as a master key to foreign languages, the tool which gives us and most complete means of accessing a foreign language". However,

as (Muriel, 1987), points out, languages like cultures are rarely sufficient in themselves. He terms this as "intercourse". This intercourse is clearly brought to light by (Butzkamm, 1962, p.49) who emphasized that in cases of naturally occurring bilingualism, both languages help each other out, supplementing each other reciprocally, and disrupting each other's development far less than previously assumed. (Tracy, 1996) among others, clearly argues that languages can promote each other's development reciprocally.

Although learning a second language is a difficult and laborious work, writers such as (Sanz, 1997), (Munoz, 2000), (Sagasta, 2003) and (Lasagabaster, 1998) have shown that in certain circumstances, life with two or more languages can lead to advantages, not only with regard to language knowledge but also in terms of cognitive and sociopragmatic development. This is perhaps the reason why Cummins' Threshold Hypothesis (1991) states that a certain level of proficiency in both languages has to be attained in order to profit from the cognitive advantages which are related to a heightened level of metalinguistic awareness, creative or divergent thinking, communicative sensitivity and further language learning. All these are skills which develop at the higher level of creativity and reorganization of information (Baker, 2006). Generally speaking, cognizance of metaphors includes the ability to detect the similarity between disparate domains and to use one domain to talk about or to understand something about another domain. This cognizance is believed to consist of metaphor awareness and strategies for comprehending and creating metaphors (Deignan, Gabrys & Solska, 1997).

Considering metaphor as a process through which we construe the world as well as the essence of our thoughts and learning, metaphors undoubtedly stand as an essential

tool for investigating our understanding and conception. In academic settings, metaphors have been used to encourage learners' insight and understanding (Zheng and Song, 2010). The belief is that an analysis of metaphor use is a reliable way of making otherwise unvoiced assumptions explicit, which has informed the methodology of a number of recent of educational research. Thus, since metaphor functions as a cognitive instrument of observing the world and creating new senses, it is significant to introduce metaphor into language teaching. Similarly, in addition to being a wonderful way of portraying teachers' understanding of teaching, metaphors help educators to focus on their own teaching style. By studying their own teaching metaphors, they can reflect on the methods and practices that accompany particular metaphors and how they impact their classroom.

The fact that the same metaphor can be interpreted by readers in quite different ways further confirms the assumption that the practice of translation is a risky undertaking, requiring not simply the exchange of linguistically packaged ideas, but an effort of imagination and analogical reasoning on the part of the context. Thus, on the perspective of cultivating students' critical thinking skills, language teachers ought to make full use of metaphors to greatly enhance the rhetorical effects and make the expressions of the sentences vivid and interesting, which will stimulate the students' metaphor awareness. Indeed, metaphors are indications of the way teachers think about teaching and also guide the way they act in the classroom as (Clandinin, 1986) suggested. But the questions that the current study sought to answer were: what does it entail to understand metaphorical use of language in discourse among teachers? In addition what is the impact of bilingualism on the interlingual cognizance of metaphors? This study will explore the metaphorical cognizance between English and Luganda, the two languages in contact in Uganda and have had an intercourse and

maintained prolonged contact within a broad field of communication. This is because studies such as (Yan, 2015) have indicated that the higher capacity of metaphors interpretation and expressions the teachers have, the easier the students' critical thinking skills can be improved.

Teacher demands and expectations today are far greater than they have ever been. In classrooms where what is communicated, practiced, and perceived greatly affect and impact students, it is imperative that Luganda and English teachers learn how to effectively use metaphors in the teaching and learning process within the multi-cultural school setting. Albeit studies using metaphor as a research tool have increased considerably in other countries, no empirical study has been conducted to examine the degree of interlingual cognizance of metaphorical expressions among teachers in Uganda hence the justification for this study.

1.2   Statement of the problem

The use of metaphor as a rhetorical device has long been recognized by scholars and researchers in the field of language and literature. Today, a great amount of importance has been attached to the use of this figurative language with particular emphasis put on teaching and learning language in the field of language teacher training (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999). This is in realization of the fact that the ability to understand and apply metaphor in communication is the key to teach, learn and use language. In the field of linguistics, metaphor is no longer thought of as a mere decoration of language, but functions as a cognitive instrument which pervades people's everyday language. However, despite the prevalent use of metaphorical language and recognition of metaphorical analysis in teaching, there is still need to understand the metaphorical use of language in discourse in Uganda. Secondly, therte

is a need to assess the impact of bilingualism on the interlingual cognizance of metaphors and whether teachers' competency in using metaphors in the first language enhances their competency in the second language. Therefore, the area of interest in this study was exclusively on determining the degree of interlingual cognizance of metaphorical expressions among bilingual secondary school teachers of Luganda and English.

1.3   Objectives of the study

The study is guided by the following objectives;

General objective

To establish the degree of interlingual cognizance of metaphorical expressions among bilinguals.

Specific objectives

1. To investigate what it entails to understand metaphorical use of language in discourse.

2. To assess the impact of bilingualism on interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse

3. To propose enhancement measures for interlingual cognizance of metaphors among bilingual speakers.

1.4 Scope of the study

The study took place in Busiro county Wakiso district. Wakiso district is the seat of the best perfoming government-aided secondary schools in the whole country. A total of 70 teachers were selected from fourteen schools using purposive sampling. The sub

counties where these schools are located were randomly selected. Wakiso district equally has the highest number of English and Luganda bilingual teachers in government-aided secondary schools in the whole country. According to the context of this study, a true bilingual is a teacher whose L1 is Luganda, moreover, a teacher who teaches English only, English and Luganda or Luganda only. This presupposes that they will have formally studied both English and Luganda for not less than sixteen years. This is basically a linguistic study, investigating metaphorical cognizance in discourse in both English and Luganda languages. These languages constitute part of Uganda's linguistic diversity and the temporal scope the researcher used was six (6) months.

This study examined the following experiential domains in order to gauge the bilinguals' metaphorical cognizance levels:

1. Love is a journey metaphor.

2. Beauty metaphors

3. Rule and governance metaphors.

The universality of the above selected domains makes them more comprehensible than the rest and their universal images cut across both cultures which quickens our understanding.

1.5 Significance of the study

The study will be a significant contribution to linguists in general and Makerere University Centre for Language and Commnication in particular. Since English and Luganda are widely used by Ugandans, an interlingual study of metaphorical

cognizance between these languages would be an indication of the degree of the user's communicative competence levels in both languages.

1.6 The theoretical framework

The study focused on the correct and clear use of metaphors in interlingual discourse. Therefore, the introduction, review of related literature, research methodology, presentation, analysis, interpretation of data, discussions, conclusions and recommendations were based on two theories- The Conceptual Metaphor Theory for LOVE IS A JOURNEY METAPHOR and The Pragmatic Theory of Metaphor for MORE FLEETING METAPHORS thus beauty together with Rule and Governance metaphors.

The conceptual metaphor theory was first provided in detail by Lakoff and Johnson in *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). This theory has questioned and challenged the traditional linguistic views which are held by philosophers such as Aristotle. Traditionally, metaphor is viewed as a matter of words rather than thought or action. In literary contexts, metaphor is above the everyday ordinary language. They believe that the function of the metaphor is only as a device of the poetic imagination and *rhetorical flourish* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Conceptual metaphor theory indicates that metaphor can be essential and pervasive in language and thought. Metaphor is not only *a matter of words* (Lakoff & Turner, 1989). Human thought processes are largely metaphorical and the human conceptual system is structured and defined in a metaphorical way. According to this view, metaphor plays a major role in people's everyday language use and thinking. There are two levels of metaphor- the conceptual and the linguistic (ibid).

At the conceptual level, a metaphor is the relationship between two concepts, one of which functions as the source and the other the target. The relationship is in form of *target domain is or as source domain*. For example, "argument is war" (Lakoff & Johnson , 1980). The particular relation between source and target domain is based on the basic conceptual correspondences between two domains. The other level, the linguistic, is motivated by the conceptual metaphor, and represents the realization in words. It appears in the forms of everyday written and spoken language. Thus, for example, a variety of metaphorical expressions are developed from the conceptual metaphor.

Argument is war such as *your claims are indefensible. He attacked every weak point in my argument* and *I demolished his argument* (ibid).

Conceptual metaphors can be divided into different groups in the eyes of researchers. (Boers,2003), suggests that there are two broad categories: primary and complex metaphors. According to the primary "basic conceptual associations are predictors of how and whether linguistic data may be interpreted and most metaphors are most clearly grounded in aspects of our abstract experiences such as up-down and in-out. For instance, "Happy is up" and "Sad is down" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Complex metaphors develop from primary metaphors. Consider the complex metaphor "Death is a thief" (Turner, 1991).

According to the conceptual metaphor theory, metaphors and other forms of figurative language are not necessarily creative expressions. This is admittedly a somewhat unusual idea, as we ordinarily associate figurative language with poetry and with the creative aspects of language. But (Gibbs, 1994), suggests that "what is frequently seen

as a creative expression of some idea is often only a spectacular instantiation of specific metaphorical entailments that arise from the small set of conceptual metaphors shared by many individuals within a culture" (p424). The conceptual model assumes that the underlying nature of our thought processes is metaphorical. That is, we use metaphor to make sense of our experience. Thus according to Gibbs (ibid), when we encounter a verbal metaphor it automatically activates the corresponding conceptual metaphor.

Gibbs and colleagues have provided some evidence for the conceptual metaphor theory. (Gibbs, 1994), has suggested that metaphors are accessed quickly because they instantiate conceptual metaphors. Further evidence comes in a study of imagery (Gibbs&O' Brien, 1990). Participants were given idioms (*blow your stack*, *flip your lid*, *hit the ceiling*) and nonidiomatic expressions (*blow the whistle*, *flip your hat*, *hit the wall*) and asked to report the visual imagery that each phrase elicited. Images for idioms were very similar to one another across participants, but images for non-idiomatic phrases varied considerably. Gibbs and O' Brien (ibid) suggest that the consistency of the idiom images is due to the constraining influence of conceptual metaphors.

(Nayak&Gibbs,1990), found that participants gave higher appropriateness ratings to *blow her stack* in a story that described a woman's anger as being like heat in a pressurized container (ANGER IS HEATED FLUID IN A CONTAINER) than in a story that implied ANGER IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR (for instance., bit his head off). Thus it seems that readers judge the appropriateness of idioms in context by assessing the fit between the conceptual metaphor underlying the idiom and the context.

Similarly, (Gibbs,1992b) describes a study in which participants were presented with a short scenario that depicted the basic elements of domains associated with conceptual metaphors. The domains included conceptual metaphors such as THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT (that is, insanity). They were asked a series of questions about the domain, such as how a fragile object in a container might break. They were also questioned about the idioms that are related to conceptual metaphors. Gibbs (ibid) concludes that participants' understanding of idioms was closely related to their understanding of the domains on which the idioms presumably were based.

1.7 Elements of the Conceptual Theory of Metaphor

Hereunder are the five elements (tenets) of the Conceptual theory of Metaphor:

"Conceptual Metaphor Theory rejects the notion that metaphor is a decorative device,peripheral to language and thought.Instead the theory holds that metaphor is central to thought and thereofore to language.From this starting point, a numberof tenets are derived which are discussed here with particular reference to language.These tenets are:

- Metaphors structure thinking;

- Metaphors structure knowledge;

- Metaphor is central to abstract language.

- Metaphor is grounded in physical experience.

- Metaphor is ideological" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980,p.120).

The Pragmatic Theory of Metaphor according to (Searle, 1975) investigates the cultural differences at the pragmatic level that operate in the process of intercultural

communication. It argues that it is the differences of the socio-cultural norms or conventions underlying language use or what are called pragmatic diversity and the tendency of people from different cultures to judge and evaluate the behaviour of others by their own cultural standard and criterion that often lead to miscommunication breakdowns. The theory stipulates that the pragmatic norms or conventions, those operating at the interlingual cognizance of metaphors, may largely help to demonstrate the membership of the interlocutors in a given situation in the intercultural interactional settings.

According to the theory, the cultural values, norms, or conventions shape the way we speak or program what is appropriate behaviour and what is not in a given situation. However, values, norms or conventions differ from culture to culture and this kind of diversity leads the tendency for people from different cultural groups to judge or evaluate the behaviour of others by their own cultural standard. This kind of diversity is called the cultural differences in sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic conventions or preferably socio-cultural pragmatic diversity, or pragmatic diversity in short. It is the unawareness of this pragmatic diversity that leads to intercultural misinterpretation and misunderstanding.

Although in dealing with interpersonal relationship and communication, the social functions of language or communication, as well as tasks that are to be accomplished may be universal, the pragmatic norms or conventions underlying the performance and realization of these functions and tasks may differ from culture to culture. For example, every language, in the world may perform the functions such as greeting, complimenting, apologizing, refusing, requesting, invitation etc. However, culture selects norms or conventions or linguistic strategies unique to its own culture, to

accomplish each of them in given situations. What or which options or strategies will be in favour depends on culturally-based pragmatic preferences. These culturally-based pragmatic norms or conventions shape how a pragmatic meaning is conveyed in a given context and how this pragmatic meaning should be interpreted.

It appears the conceptual metaphor theory is better equipped to account for the range of results found in psycholinguistic studies of figurative language than the pragmatic theory. This does not mean that we do not use conventions to understand language but only that we do not necessarily do so every time we understand a metaphor or idiom. The use of conventions may be a back up system that is helpful, for instance, when we encounter a metaphor we have not heard before.

1.8 Elements of the Pragmatic Theory of Metaphor

Semantic theories of metaphor fail to distinguish metaphors from literal statements. A pragmatic theory explains metaphor as a speech Act. A speaker is using signs with a literal meaning to create a new ideal intentional structure or paradigm which has no literal meaning. Metaphors present a specific qualitatively primitive way of experiencing something and they are understood through intuition in the phenomenological sense of seeing a structure. The function of framing new experiential paradigms increases the expressive powers of a language.More generally verbal and non-verbal forms can be understood as metaphors creating new ways of seeing the world (Searle, 1975, p.24).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

Metaphor and culture are inseparable; a true bilingual needs a thorough comprehension of both cultures owing to the fact that language is a roadmap and the greatest cultural transmitter. Research into the cultural conventions and images gives knowledge that makes a perfect bilingual.

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part is the literature review and is covered in three sections; in consonance with the objectives and research questions of the study. Section one deals with what it entails to understand a metaphor and is divided into eight subsections: subsection one deals with teaching and learning the soico-cultural components of language, subsection two focuses on the benefits of teaching socio-cultural components, subsection three looks at the structure of knowledge in a conceptual domain,subsection four explains the conventional metaphor, subsection five advances love is a journey metaphor, subsection six discusses more fleeting metaphors, subsection seven presents beauty metaphors and lastly subsection eight brings out rule and governance metaphors.

Section two deals with biculturalism and its impact on the interlingual cognizance of metaphors and has two subsections: subsection one deals with the intertranslatability of metaphors in discourse and subsection two discusses determining utterance equivalences in interlingual translation.

Section three dealt with enhancing a bilingual's metaphoric cognizance and is divided into one subsection which looks at pragmatic diversity, cultural norms and pragmatic transfer (knowledge).

The second and last part of the chapter presents the theoretical framework of the study.

2.0.1 Definition of a metaphor

Metaphor comes from the Greek Term *metaphora* or *metapherein* meaning *to transfer* or *to carry across*- a rhetorical figurative expression of similarity or dissimilarity in which a direct, non-literal substitution or identity is made between one thing and another: *similarity*, as in "Johny's belly is a pink balloon" or *dissimilarity*, as in " the president's proposed budget is an inflated balloon". Therefore, metaphor refers to language that directly compares seemingly unrelated subjects. In the simplest case, this takes the form: "The [first subject] is a [second subject].

> **"More generally, a metaphor is a rhetorical trope that describes a first subject as being or equal to a second object in some way. Thus, the first subject can be economically described because implicit and explicit attributes from the second subject are used in literature, especially in poetry, where with few words, emotions and associations from one context are associated with objects and entities in a different context" (Lakoff, 1999).**

- A metaphor at a deeper level of study can however be referred to as an image that represents cultural concepts from where the linguistic expressions and manifestations of different languages are derived. This observation therefore puts an end to the old time school definitions that only tend to look at

metaphor as a figure of speech. According to this definition metaphor ceases to be looked at as something quite incomprehensible and instead becomes a concept that can be understood once one has a good understanding of a given culture. This will therefore presuppose that once one examined the cultural values that embody a language, they can fairly interpret the imagistic details that drive metaphors in discourse. For instance the concept of weather amongst the English is very important. It is therefore not surprising to see that many metaphorical expressions are derived from the weather and its conditions in general.On the other hand the Luganda language equally has the concept of weather although its linguistic expressions are not similar to those of English. The following metaphorical expressions are for instance used in English while addressing the concept of weather:

To feel hot under the collar, such a metaphorical expression points to two realities about the English Culture- the cold weather and the corresponding item of clothing (the neck tie) but when the heat swelters, it becomes unpleasant for the English man wearing a neck tie-**hot under the collar**. It is a fact to note that in Luganda, neck ties are alien and not part of their cultural wear. That presupposes therefore, that the speakers of Luganda will use totally different expressions to comment on weather; whether cold or warm. Such expressions can include but not limited to the following:

Peleketya w'omusana (roasting or extremely hot).

Obude bwakawansanzi (baking or very hot and dry)

It is noticeable that all the Luganda expressions with equivalence in meaning to the English expression **hot under the collar** do not contain any item of clothing.

Other metaphorical expressions drawn from the concept of weather in English include:

It is raining cats and dogs. Instead of translating this as *enkuba etonya bukapa na mbwa,* an efficient and metaphorically cognizant interlingual translator will say that *enkuba effudembye*. Therefore, such expressions illustrate that at the conceptual level, both languages have weather in mind though at the linguistic level, the expressions are different owing to the different cultural imagery.

The following expressions equally address weather:

A warm welcome, to freeze somebody out, to be snowed under, to storm out and a hail of abuse. The above expressions translate far differently in Luganda**.**

To express a warm welcome, Luganda has expressions like:

Okubugaana essanyu (Beaming or being inundated with joy)

Essanyu lya mwoki wa gonja (Exuberance likened to one roasting plantain).

Therefore, that is sufficient evidence to suggest that, concepts underlie the linguistic expressions from which the cultural imagery is derived for one to communicate metaphorically across cultures.

2.0.2 Language Philosophers and the metaphor

Several philosophers of language share a wide range of views on metaphor: They may accept the traditional literal-figurative distinction. They may, like (Davidson, 1980), say that there is no metaphorical meaning, and the most metaphorical utterances are either trivially true or trivially false. Or, like (Grice,1981), they will assume that metaphor is in the realm of pragmatics, that is, that a metaphorical meaning is no

more than the literal meaning of some other sentence which can be arrived at by some pragmatic principle. This is required, since the only real meaning for them is literal meaning, and pragmatic principles are those principles that allow one to say one thing (with a literal meaning) and mean something else (with a different, but nonetheless literal meaning).

(Carroll, 2008) states that metaphorical language is language that means one thing literally but is taken to mean something different. It is a ubiquitous aspect of language. (Honeck, 1997) has noted the prevalence of metaphorical language in psychotherapeutic interviews, various essays, and the (Kennedy-Nixon debates, Pollio, Barlow & Fine, 1977). Metaphorical language is present in our daily discourse, in our poetry and in our religious worship. To quote Cacciari & Glucksberg:

> **"Figurative language is no longer perceived as merely an ornament added to everyday, straightforward literal language, but instead viewed as a powerful communicative and conceptual tool" (Cacciari & Glucksberg, 1994).**

2.1.1   What it entails to understand a metaphor

(Lakoff and Turner, 1989), argue that to understand what is metaphorical, we must begin with what is not metaphorical. In brief to the extent that a concept is understood and structured on its own terms – without making use of the structure imported from a completely different conceptual domain – we will say that it is not metaphorical.

The word "extent," they emphasize, was chosen with care. A given concept may be metaphorically understood and structured in some respects but not in others. Consider dogs, for example. We do not conventionally understand a dog's appearance via a

mapping between it and a completely different conceptual domain. Thus, part of our conceptualization of a dog is non-metaphorical: the four legs, wagging tail, cold wet black nose, and so on. Of course, we may invent all the metaphors we please in which non-metaphorical concepts are targets (Lakoff, 1995). We might say, for instance, that a dog's wagging tail is its flag, signaling to us. But this does not mean that the wagging tail cannot be understood non-metaphorically as just a tail; to the extent that it is so understood it is not metaphorical. Moreover the dog's tail is not conventionally, automatically, and unconsciously understood as a flag. That is, the tail-as-flag metaphor is not part of our *conventional* concept of a dog's tail. So far as we can tell, there is nothing metaphorical about the conventional concept of a dog's tail.

But when we understand a dog being "loyal" we understand an instinctive property of the dog in terms of a human personality trait. When we conceptualize a dog as "loyal" we are conceptualizing that aspect of the dog via metaphor. In short, it is misleading to think of concepts as a whole as being all metaphorical or all non-metaphorical (Lakoff, 1999). Metaphoricity has to do with particular aspects of the conceptual structure. Part of a concept's structure can be understood metaphorically, using the structure imported from another domain, while part may be understood directly, that is without metaphor.

To understand metaphors therefore, one needs to look at the concepts behind the linguistic expressions. These concepts form that culture's world view. In the English culture for example, a lot of metaphors relate to nature as a concept. The expressions that will emerge in the English language will therefore carry the imagery of nature since the images are culture-bound. Whereas nature is a universal reality, each culture

will look at it from its point of view. Consequently the linguistic expressions will be different. English metaphors that relate to nature include:

- *Throwing some light on the issue; making some punch, with wine, fruit juice and a little brandy; to break ice; the agreement was hedged around by a large number of restrictions; that politician is a sly fox et cetera.*

The use of "light","break the ice",and "hedged" are all nature-based metaphors that are used to express how the English view the world.

The Luganda native speakers would metaphorically say *okutangaaza ensonga* and this would be the metaphorical equivalence of *throwing more light on the issue* which is *to clarify* in plain English although the verbs *to throw* in English and *okutangaza* in Luganda are quite different. The Luganda verb *okutangaza* is more straightforward than throwing light because the intended meaning in both words is to clarify something. Since the native speakers of Luganda have no ice to break,expressions like *okumalawo ekiwejjowejjo*,*okujjawo obunkenke*,or *okukyamusa*,*okujja ekisubi ku liiso*,*okumalako ekyewungula* fall within the possible equivalents in Luganda. This means that one's translation can never be uniquely monolithic.

Many metaphors relate to water:

- *The ocean of his mind was awash with new ideas.*

- *I do not want to go out with him. He is so wet.*

- *Waves of disappointment swept through him.*

- *He watered down his proposal quite a lot and in the end was not radical enough.*

- *My legs turned to water and I could not move.*

Of late, there are metaphorical slang expressions in Luganda that are related to water:

- **Mazzi mawanvu**, loosely transalting as somebody who is rich, good at doing something, strong and the like.

- **Mazzi mampi**, loosely translating as somebody who is poor, broke, less popular especially amongst the local artists.

However, new expressions can form from water after understanding the concept very well. It would be metaphorical, with water as a causative to say the following expressions in Luganda:

- **Amayengo g'omukwano**, implying the hardships or waves associated with love.

- **Atudde mu gayanja g'ebizibu**, literally meaning that he or she is seated in oceans of problems.

- **Awugira mukwonoona**, literally translating as he or she is swimming in committing evil or mischief.

A lot of metaphors are based on gardens or agriculture in the English language. For instance, we often use the word root to refer to the cause of a problem. It can also be used to describe something starting to grow:

- *The root of this problem is Blair's decision to go to Iraq.*

- *If we keep on putting this idea forward, it might actually take root.*

- *The labour party wants to have a very strong grass-roots campaign.*

- *After a rocky start, their romance blossomed.*

- *This is a thorny issue so it will take some time to sort it out.*

Conceptualizing gardens or agriculture, Luganda will have different expressions that pertain to the culture of the Baganda and these will include:

- **Omwana atandise okumera**, *okumera* would mean to take root in English but in Luganda, it means that the child is starting to misbehave, or becoming

bigheaded and treating elders or seniors with contempt. And in certain instances where the offended senior is angrier, they will tell the child that, *otandise okumera amajigo* or *amagego* according to some dialects within the language.

- **Kanaluzaala**, **kanalusambulira** or **kajampuni** are the expressions used to refer to the root of the problem.

- **Abalungi ndagala namu**, proverb, implying that the beautiful ones are analogous to banana leaves that are ever plentiful in the garden.

- **Omusajja kiti kya muwogo**, proverb, meaning that a man is like a cassava cutting that can grow wherever it is dispersed.

- **Okukungula sere**, idiom, implying harvesting wind. Harvest is an agricultural term though the expressions used with it in Luganda and English differ. *Sere* is a parasitic herb or plant therefore undesired.

Comparatively looking at the expressions above, it is important to note that for one to be interlingually cognizant with metaphors, knowledge of concepts in the two cultures is key. After grasping the concepts then, an academic step is taken to consider the imagistic expressions a culture will use based on its world view. It is at this juncture that an efficient and effective interlingual translator is formed.

2.1.2 Teaching and learning the socio-cultural components of language

Understanding metaphors and the use of metaphors are two different phenomena. Earlier scholars especially Lakoff and Johnson have expounded a lot on the understanding of a metaphor. However, the correct and clear use of metaphors still remains a grey area in the minds of language users. This can be dymystified through

teaching the socio-cultural elements that underpin or buttress the use of metaphors in communication.

The dialectical connection between language and culture has always been a concern of L2 teachers and educators. Whether culture of the target language is to be incorporated into L2 teaching has been a subject of rapid change throughout language teaching history. In the course of time, the pendulum of ELT practioners' opinion has swung against or for teaching culture in context of language teaching. For example, during the first decades of the 20th century researchers discussed the importance and possibilities of including cultural components into L2 curriculum (Sysoyev & Donelson, 2002); the advent of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the late 70s marks a critical shift for teaching culture, for the paradigm shift from an approach based largely on form and structure to a plurality of approaches causing an intended side effect: the negligence of culture (Pulverness, 2003).

Recent studies focus on the seamless relationship between L2 teaching and target culture teaching, especially over the last decade with the writings of scholars such as Bryam (1989; 1994a; 1994b; 1997a; 1997b) and (Kramasch, 1998; 1993; 1996; 2001). People involved in language teaching have again begun to understand the intertwined relationship between culture and language (Pulverness, 2003). It has been emphasized that without the study of culture, learning the clear and correct use of a metaphor is inaccurate and incomplete. For L2 students, language study seems sensesless if they know nothing about the culture of the people who speak the target language or the country in which the target language is spoken.Acquiring a language means a lot more than the manipulation of syntax and lexicon.Bada states that:

"The need for cultural literacy in ELT arises mainly from the fact that most language learners, not exposed to cultural elements of the society in question, seem to encounter significant hardship in communicating meaning to native speakers"(Bada, 2000).

In addition, nowadays the L2 culture is presented as an interdisciplinary core in many L2 curriculum designs and textbooks (Sysoyev & Donelson, 2002).

There is no such a thing as human nature independent of culture; studying a metaphor in an L2, in a sense, is trying to figure out the nature of another people (McDevitt, 2004). If as McDevitt 74 holds human nature is seamlessly related to culture, then studying L2 involves the study of L2 culture. Actually, the conditionality of the previous sentence could be proved inappropriate. The mutual relation between language and culture, i.e. the interaction of language and culture has long been settled thanks to the writings of prominent philosophers such as (Wittgenstein,1980;1999), (Saussure, 1966), (Foucalt, 1994), (Dilthey, 1989), (Von Humboldt, 1876), (Adorno, 1993), (Davidson, 1999), (Quine, 1980) and (Chomsky, 1968). These are the names first to come to mind when the issue is the relation between language and culture. Yet, the most striking linguists dealing with the issue of language and culture are (Sapir, 1962) and (Whorf, 1956). They are the scholars whose names are often used synonymously with the term "Linguistic Relativity) (Richards et al., 1992). The core of their theory is that:

- We perceive the world in terms of categories and distinctions found in our native language and

- What is found in one language may not be found in another language due to cultural differences.

Although the ground of discussion on language and culture has been cleared for ages, it is not until the 1980s that the need for teaching culture in language classes is indicated, reaching it in the 1990s, thanks to the efforts of Bryam and Kramsch as mentioned previously. For instance in the case of ELT, (Pulverness, 2003) asserts that due to undeniable growth of English as an international language cultural content as anything other than contextual background began to be included in language teaching programs.

2.1.2 The benefits of teaching socio-cultural components of language

Although by mid 80s, various advantages of teaching culture in L2 classes and eliciting meaning given images embedded therein, there were still problems about what should be taught and how culture could be taught most beneficially. These questions were faced more and more in the 90s (Kitao, 2000).

If we turn to the relationship between culture and language, we see some remarkable comments; for example, (Sapir, 1921) argued that 'language, race and culture are not necessarily correlated', adding the remark 'language and our thought-grooves are inextricably interrelated, are, in a sense, one and the same'. Yet this single remark does not supply a satisfactory reply to the question of why culture teaching should be involved in language teaching. (Kitao, 2000) giving reference to several authors lists some of the benefits of teaching culture as follows:

- Studying culture gives students a reason to study the target language as well as rendering the study of L2 meaningful (Stainer, 1971).

- From the perspective of learners, one of the major problems in language teaching is to conceive the native speakers of target language as a real person. Although grammar books give so called genuine examples from real life, without background knowledge those real situations may be considered fictive by the learners. In addition providing access into cultural aspect of language, learning culture would help learners relate the abstract sounds and forms of a language to real people and places (Chastain, 1971).

- The effect of motivation in the study of L2 has been proved by experts like (Gardner &Lambert (1959, 1965, and 1972). In achieving high motivation, culture classes do not have a great role because learners like culturally based activities such as singing, dancing, role playing, doing research on countries and peoples, language etc. The study of culture increases learners' not only curiosity about and interest in target speech communities but also grasp the imagistic details that motivate the use of metaphors in discourse. For example, when some professors introduced the cultures of the L2 they taught, the learners' interests in those classes increased a lot and the classes based on culture became to be preferred more highly than traditional classes. In an age of post-modernism, in an age of tolerance towards different ideologies, religions, sub-cultures, we need to understand not only the other culture but also our own culture. Most people espouse ethnocentric views due to being culture bound:

"Which leads to major problems when they confront a different culture. Being culture bound, they just try to reject or ignore the new culture. As if it is possible to make a hierarchy of cultures they begin to talk about the supremacy of their culture. This is

because they have the difficulty understanding or accepting people with points of view based on other views of the world. This point is also highlighted by (Kramsch, 2001). People who identify themselves as members of a social group (family, neighbourhood, professional or ethnic affiliation, nation) acquire common ways of viewing the world through their interactions with other members of the same group. These views are reinforced through institutions like the family, the school, the workplace, the church, the government and other sites of socialization through their lives. Common attitudes, beliefs and values are reflected in the way members of the group use language for example, what they choose to say or not to say and how they say it (p.6)"

- Besides these benefits, studying culture gives learners a liking for the native speakers of the target language. Studying culture also plays a useful role in general education; studying culture, we could also learn about the geography, history, etc of the target culture (Cooke, 1970).

(Mckay, 2003) contends that culture influences language teaching in two ways: linguistic and pedagogical. Linguistically, it affects the semantic, pragmatic, and stylistic and discourse levels of the language. Pedagogically, it influences the choice of the language materials because cultural content of the language materials and the cultural basis of the teaching methodology are to be taken into consideration while deciding upon the language materials. For example, while some text books provide examples from the target culture, some others use source culture materials.

In conclusion, it is very clear that culture classes have a humanizing and a motivating effect to the language learner to discover the cultural underpinnings that underlie the formation of metaphor in expression. They help learners observe similarities and differences among various cultural motivations and images from which metaphors are derived. Today, most of L2 students around the world live in a monolingual and mmonocultural environment. Consequently, they become culture-bound individuals who tend to use metaphors in a different language unconsciously due to lack of cultural knowledge orchestrating the use of that stylistic device.

2.1.3 The structure of knowledge in a conceptual domain

This sub-section examines metaphors that unconsciously and automatically organize our ordinary comprehension of the world by mapping concepts onto others, for example, LOVE IS A JOURNEY. Under this image mapping, rich knowledge and rich inferential structure are mapped from the domain of journeys onto life in both languages.

2.1.4 Conventional metaphor

(Lakoff &Turner 1989), point out that conventional metaphor, of course, also depends on conventional knowledge. One understands a target domain in terms of a source domain. Take for example, the **LOVE IS A JOURNEY** metaphor that is under discussion in this chapter. Our understanding of love as a journey uses knowledge about journeys. All journeys involve travelers, paths traveled, places where we start, and places where we have been. Some journeys are purposeful and have destinations that we set out for, while others may involve wandering without any destination in

mind. To understand love as a journey is to have in mind, consciously or more likely unconsciously, a correspondence between a traveler and a person in love, the road traveled and the "course" of the love relationship, a starting point and the inception of the relationship, and so on.

One of the reasons that this form of understanding is powerful is that it makes use of a general knowledge of journeys. This knowledge has a skeletal structure rich enough to distinguish journeys from other kinds of activities, but not so rich as to rule out any particular kind of journey. As a consequence, the understanding of love is a journey permits not just a single simple-minded conceptualization of love but rather a rich and varied one (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). Because our knowledge of journeys includes options for types of journeys, the metaphorical meaning of love in terms of a journey includes options for a corresponding variety of understandings of love. To the extent that one views love as purposeful, those purposes are viewed as destinations, and we can act accordingly by setting out to reach them, getting around impediments, and accepting guidance. Correspondingly, to the extent that we see love as not involving purposes, we can view our journey as wandering and observing the landscape.

Two things permit such richness: the structure of our knowledge of journeys and our ability to map from that structured knowledge to a conception of love (Kimball, 1973). The structure of our knowledge of journeys can be seen as having well differentiated components such as travelers, a starting point, a path,impediments and so on; some are required and some like destinations, vehicles, companions and guides are optional. We will call knowledge structured in such a skeletal form a "shema", and we will use the term "slots" for elements of a schema that are to be filled in. Thus a **JOURNEY** schema has a slot for **TRAVELER** that can be filled by any particular

person whom we understand to be on journey. Indeed, the very concept of a traveler can be defined only relative to the concept of a journey. Understanding that someone is a traveler, understands that he fills the role of **TRAVELER** in a **JOURNEY** schema.

The metaphor **LOVE IS A JOURNEY** is thus a mapping of the structure of the **JOURNEY** schema onto the domain of love in such a way as to set up the appropriate correspondences between **TRAVELER** and **PERSON IN A LOVE RELATIONSHIP** between **STARTING POINT** and **INCEPTION,** and so on.

Part of the power of such a metaphor is its ability to create structure in our understanding of love. Love, after all, needs to be viewed as a journey. It need not be viewed as having a path, or destinations, or impediments to travel, or vehicles. That structuring of our understanding of love comes from the structure of our knowledge about journeys. When we reason about love in terms of destinations, forks in the road, roadblocks, and guides and so on, we are importing patterns of inference from the domain of journeys to the domain of love. For example, we can infer from the fact that someone is *spinning his wheels* that he is not getting anywhere and will not reach his destination. We can infer from the fact that someone has *hit a road block* that if he is to continue, he must deal with it in some way: remove it, get over it, get around it or find another route. Much of our reasoning about love involves inferences of this sort. Thus the power to reason about so abstract an idea as life comes very largely through metaphor (Johnson, 1987).

We understand and reason using our conceptual system, which includes an inventory of structures, of which shemas and metaphors are established parts. Once we learn a

schema, we do not have to learn it again or make it up fresh each time we use it. It becomes conventionalized and as such is used automatically, effortlessly, and even unconsciously (Searle, 1979). That is part of the power of schemas: we can use these ready tools without having to put any energy into making or finding them. Simmilarly, once we learn a conceptual metaphor, it too is just there, conventionalized, a ready and powerful conceptual tool- automatic, effortless, and largely unconscious. The things most alive in our conceptual system are those things that we use constantly, unconsciously and automatically. They include conceptual schemas and conceptual metaphors.

For similar reasons that schemas and metaphors give us power to conceptualise and reason, so they have power over us. Anything that we rely on constantly, unconsciously and automatically is so much part of us that it cannot be easily resisted, in large measure because it is barely even noticed (Strawson, 1964). To the extent that we use a conceptual system or a conceptual metaphor, we accept its validity. For this reason, conventionalized schemas and metaphors have persuasive power over us.

2.1.5 Love is a journey metaphor

Image-schema mappings from one domain are linked onto the structure of another where proliferation of detail in images limits image-mappings to highly specific cases. (Barcelona, 2009), postulates that understanding any metaphorical expression in discourse requires knowledge. We take for granted much of everyday knowledge we need to understand figurative language.

LOVE IS A JOUNEY METAPHOR will therefore draw from Luganda figures of speech, its linguistic symbolism, environment and other intertwined realities within the Kiganda culture. These are the deeper-seated concepts upon which every culture stands. LOVE IS A JOURNEY METAPHOR will certainly have different imagistic and linguistic expressions in Luganda. LOVE IS A JOURNEY METAPHOR will be analogous to OKWAGALA KUGUMIIKIRIZA. This implies that images alluding to endurance will motivate and render creation of linguistic expressions about love in Luganda language. Such expressions among others can include but not limited to:

- *Atudde ku maggwa* (Used to describe a relationship facing its ups and downs)

- *Atudde ku nkato* (Losely translating a situation where the love relationship is full of hurts and pains).

- *Alikukanayokya ani*. (Describes a severe love relationship)

- *Tusejjede*, *ensenjere* is a white ant that moves slow but sure.

- *Tuvuunuse*, loosely translating, we have overcome or surmounted. This points to the hills that characterize part of Buganda's terrain.

- *Tubebbedde*, *okubebbera,* is to move with difficulty because one has fresh wounds developed after removing jiggers from their feet or toes. Such an expression can be used in Luganda to refer to a relationship that has had a fair share of its problems while coming around.

- *Tuli mu katu*, *akatu,* means a puzzle. Occasionally used to refer to a relationship is undergoing a puzzle, a riddle or walking a tight rope.

- *Enkola ya takisi*, of late, a song that expresses the frustration of faithful women in the face of unfaithful husbands. It has become part of marital or love vocabulary in Luganda urging couples to do things the taxi way if one cannot be faithful. Cheat on them as well and will get fed up and quit.

Kawere presents two love letters. It is of great scholarly interest to examine the imagery engrossed in Fiida's communication to Edi. In the same breath, Edi gives a response and both excerpts are quoted below:

> **"Banange Edi, oyagala nkukolere ki era ntya? Oyagala nfuuke akakomo mbeerenga ku mukono, oba akaweta mbeerenga ku ngalo! Nfuuke essaawa eteevenga ku mukono, oba akatto ak'okwezizika! Nfuuke obubira mbeerenga mu bulago.oba peti eteevenga ku mubiri! Nfuuke lutanda olwokwebakako, oba essuuka ez'okweyalira! Nfuuke ekikopo eky'okunyweramu, oba ewuuma ey'okuliisisa! Nfuuke entugga mbeerenga ku mukono, oba engatto ey'okutambuza! Nfuuke essaane ey'okulirako, oba ejjiko ey'okuwuusisa!**
> **Edi, simanyi oba nga ddala omanyi banno nga bwebakwagala okuzaama obuzaami anti buli wembeera mba ndowoza Edi, olowooza nimbye mw'ekyo?" (Kawere, 2000).**

Fiida uses quite a number of visual images. In her romantic rhetorical questions, she draws from the ordinary objects; from items of clothing, decorations, jewellery to household items and utensils. Through the character of Fiida, Kawere shows a deeper understanding of the concept of love in the Kiganda culture. This is sufficient evidence to suggest that; after understanding a concept in one culture, the flow of expressions will be commensurate with the images within that culture. This presupposes therefore, that metaphor can be well comprehended. If concepts underlie the expressions, then breaking the jinx blurring one's comprehension will have been

41

realized. If I understand the concept of love in either English or Luganda culture, I will transmit my expressions freely and easily through my favourite images. The images near one's reality in that culture will most likely be drawn from. I can compare my love for a lady to the heartbeat, ticking away of the clock, very beautiful scenery I know and many other realities near me.

Comprehension of the concept is the first step.Research into the images used employed in that language will be the next task of a true bilingual. Knowledge of those images will lead to an unlimited flow of metaphorical expressions. This buttresses the argument that judging metaphor by the linguistic expressions will be misleading.

In scenarios where the cultural images are universal, the bilingual speaker's comprehension, competence and perfmance will shoot up. A rigourous study of Edi's love song to Fiida will exemplify a high degree of universal love images that traverse both the Kiganda and English cultures.

Edi answers back in a song he writes to Fiida:

"Fiida omutono omuwanvu

Yakula amaaso n'akula nnamutta

Alina ensingo yajjula ebiseera

Yakula ebigere ebitono ebirungi

Alina ennyindo yakula Kiralo

Enkowe z'omwana ntugga za kikyala

Aliko erangi enziringa 'bullaka'

Ekyenyi kya Fiida kyajjula busonda

Yakula ekiwato amakudde amatuufu

Enviri ze mpanvu okwenkana obukeedo

Mabeere ge mampi ddala ga biteeko

Yakula ebisige omukyala matendo

Olususu lwa Fiida lulinga bufumbo

Aba kuba nsigo esimbwa

Nandisimbye ne nnogako

Singa bagula mugule

Nandisonze ne mugula

Singa banyaga munyage

Nandirwanye ne munyaga

Jjangu ndabeko Fiida

Omwoyo gunuma

Jjangu nsekeko

Fiida omutono.

Jjangu ndojjeko naawe

Omwoyo gunzita.

Jjangu mpeereko,

Fiida omutono.

Mba kuba nnyonyi ebuuka,

Singa mb'eyo.

Mba kuba mpewo ekunta,

Singa mb'eyo.

Ebirowoozo nantasibwa,

Singa mb'eyo.

Ekiro ekyo n'emisana,

Singa mb'eyo!" (ibid)

Edi's description of Fiida's winsome beauty reveals the enchanting features of a woman that stimulate men's love. Edi's admiration of Fiida is conditioned by Fiida's breathtaking features in relation to height, size and curvaceous structure, pointededness of the nose, face and the magic in her eyes. Her features are an embodiment of what the Baganda refer to as *omulungi kaalala* (*a* girl with breathtaking or stunning beauty).

It is pertinent to note that, culturally, if Fiida is the epitome of beauty of a Muganda woman- small, slender, round shaped, magical eyes, fruity breasts et cetera; then, beauty to the English and Baganda is a cultural universal.This will therefore increase the degree of metaphorical cognizance between a bilingual speaker; owing to the fact that the beauty image rendering expressions are more or less the same. Considering the size of a girl like Fiida, the Baganda will have expressions like:

- *Nabutono* (Slender)

- *Lukende* (an hours glass waist)

- *Bbere tutu* (literally translating thorny breast)

44

Nonetheless several Baganda men would go for women whose body parts are fairly big and wide. In such instances, there will be a world of difference in expressions regarding beauty and love.

The English strictly prefer ladies who have small waists, small sizes in relation to boobs and bums.The following Luganda expressions reaveal though that according to the Baganda beauty can come in all sizes and shapes in light of the loveliness of a woman:

- *Kabina ndoddo* (Big bottom)

- *Kiwato* nnamuziga (round and large waistline)

The English will not always prefer curvaceous ladies. A lady with big hips, waist and bust.They always prefer models. Their expressions here will be quite different from those of the Baganda.

Moreover, it is worth mentioning that the Baganda are more meticulous concerning beauty than the English. They consider and compare more body parts while judging beauty than the English. The following expressions clearly corroborate the reality above:

- *Nsingo biseera* (curved neck)

- *Kyenyi kya masega*, *nsonda* (Nice shaped or outlined forehead) et cetera.

Amongst the English people, the colour of one's eyes is very important for instance, blue eyes, hazel, emerald, they all add up to one's beauty. Expressons about the beauty and loveliness of the eyes will therefore be different. The Baganda express it

terms of size and appearance – *maaso mbira*, *maaso ndege*, eyes likened to beads of sorts.

Relationships between people or groups in English are like physical connections. Having a good relationship is like being joined to the other person or group, and ending a relationship is like breaking this connection:

- *We have been close friends since we were five.*

- We were inseparable as children.

- *The first time that they met, they bonded immediately.*

- *I was very attached to him.*

- *The school encourages links between students and local businesses.*

When you mend a relationship according to the native speakers of English, it is as if you have fixed or repaired something that is broken.

- *We are both committed to mending our marriage.*

- *The visit is part of an attempt to repair the relationship between the two governments.*

- *I am glad to see that you have patched things up.*

- *The meeting was designed mainly as a face-mending exercise.*

- *The first step is to build bridges with the other side.*

The English metaphorical expressions above are less similar to those of Luganda. It is worth noting that in such instances, the world view is fairly universal. Looking at the Luganda expressions concerning the same concept, a lot of the expressions are the same:

- *Bategeeraganye*, meaning that the parties reached a consensus.

- *Amuddiddemu*, this implies that one of the conflicting parties has had reconsideration.

- *Nawolovu tafiira kubbala limu*, proverb, where one is pleading for a second chance.

Whereas English language uses journey mappings, Luganda will use images that are mapped to patience in terms of movements like a chameleon (Nawolovu). This is very interesting to note; owing to the fact that the concept of love is a journey is existent in both cultures but the images used to make the expressions are quite different.

2.1.6 More Fleeting metaphors

(Lakoff & Turner, 1989) argue that not all metaphors map conceptual structures onto other conceptual structures. In addition to the metaphors that unconsciously and automatically organize our ordinary comprehension of the world by mapping concepts onto other concepts, there are also more fleeting metaphors which involve not the mapping of concepts but rather the mapping of images. Consider for example this poem by William Blake in (Kennedy & Diana):

THE SICK ROSE

O Rose, thou art sick!

The invisible worm

That flies in the night

In the howling storm,

Has found out thy bed

Of crimson joy,

And his dark secret love

Does thy life destroy

(William Blake, 1757-1827)

The image of the rose in the above poem symbolizes beauty, love and freshness invaded and then destroyed by the malicious forces of nature. The sickness of the rose is metaphorical to the transient and ephemeral nature of the beauty of the rose flower. It is fresh in the day but when night falls, forces beyond its ken attack it, kill and murder its resplendence and appealing looks. The invisible worm and the storms of nature are accused of being disastrous and detrimental to the continuity of beauty and joy of the rose. The merciless nature is personified to destroy the life of the rose.It is noteworthy that in the English culture, a rose flower is a symbol of youth, beauty and love. The novel appearance of the rose flower is mapped onto the charm and magic of youth.

Therefore, in circumstances where the Kiganda culture uses the symbol of a rose flower to sing praises of say, a beautiful lady, a higher degree of interlingual cognizance of the metaphorical expressions to a bilingual speaker will be guaranteed. Songs like "Oli kimuli kya Roza" (You are a rose) by the fallen local artist Fred Mayiso, suggest that a bilingual listener to that song will without a shadow of doubt get the entire message clearly and correctly.

It is as well true and rightly so, that if imagery is drawn from other unfamiliar flowers to the Kiganda culture like the lily, jasmine,daisy and other familiar flowers within the English culture; cognizance of the message to a bilingual will be highly unlikely to be perceived.

2.1.7 Beauty metaphors

There is a class of metaphors that function to map one conventional mental image onto another. Indeed, these are more fleeting metaphors which involve not the

mapping of concepts but rather the mapping of images. Under this category of metaphors the domains are the images. They do not involve the mapping of the rich knowledge and inferential structure.

To exemplify this, the Baganda culturally use beads, a variety of decorative bells, pots, growers of bananas, a sizeable number of their metaphorical expressions will therefore emanate their cultural imagery and identity. "Ekitooke" (banana plant) can be a fair equivalence of the English rose. Some of the expressions that underpin these beautiful cultural images include:

1. *Maaso mbira*. (the beauty of one's eyes likened to beads). Beads are common place in Buganda and look quite attractive.

2. *Maaso ndege* (the nice looking round eyes compared to a certain variety of small bells). These small bells are beautiful and are often used in the Kiganda traditional dance thus a part of their cultural folklore.

3. *Obumwa bwa nsumbi*. (One's nice looking round lips are likened to the curve of a certain pot). Such an image is easily perceived and warmly appreciated because it is drawn from the heritage of the Ganda. This however is not a similar case with English because their cultural images are different.

4. *Abalungi ndagalanamu* (The beautiful ones are analogous to fresh banana leaves). These are all images within the Kiganda culture.

5. *Kayindo ka kiralo* (Pointed nose like the noses of the western nomadic pastoralists). The western tribes are migrant communities that have had a long history of contact with the Ganda. Therefore, it is

49

undeniable sociolinguistically, that they constitute part of the Ganda's stylistic discourse.

6. *Nvannungi* (Beauty equated to fresh delicious sauce with a tantalizing aroma). The Baganda caution those drawn to sparking appearances to compare those beautiful looks to good broth that gets spoilt in a short while.

Since metaphor and culture are inseparable, a true bilingual needs a thorough comprehension of both cultures owing to the fact that language is a road map and the greatest cultural transmitter. This dive into the cultural knowledge and baggage of a particular language is what largely will contribute to the creation of true bilingualism

2.1.8   Rule and governance metaphors

So far we have examined what we call structural metaphors in the previous sections, cases where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another. But there is another kind of metaphorical concept, one that does not structure one concept in terms of another but instead organizes a whole system of concepts with respect to one another. That is where rule and governance metaphors fall. Rule and governance metaphors have the structure such that HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP and BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE IS DOWN. Examples of rule and governance metaphors include:

- *Britain rules the waves.*
- *I have control over her.*
- *I am on top of the situation.*
- *He is in a superior position.*
- *He is at the height of his power.*

- *He is in the high command.*

- *He is in the upper echelon.*

- *His power rose.*

- *He ranks above in strength.*

- *He is under my control.*

- *He fell from power.*

- *His power is on the decline.*

- *He is my social inferior*

- *He is a low man on the totem pole* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

The above examples show that the metaphorical concepts we have looked at provide us with the understanding of what rule and governance metaphors are all about. It is important to see that the metaphorical structuring involved here is orientational. One concept would actually be the other, not merely be understood in terms of it.

(Glucksberg, 1982) has advanced a model that states that metaphors are class inclusion statements. That is, when we see a metaphor such as "My job is a jail", we understand it as analogous to the kinds of class inclusion statements.

But how can we assess this relation if the statement is not literally true? (Glucksberg & Keyser, 1990), suggest that the term *jail* belongs not to just one but to several different superordinate categories. It belongs to the category of buildings, which also includes hotels, hospitals, and dormitories. It also may be considered, when it is used as a vehicle of a metaphor, as a member of a category that does not have a conventional name but includes situations that are regarded as unpleasant, confining, or stifling. It is this latter category that may include the term *job*.

51

In a similar way, metaphors also require a selective activation of information from the lexicon. Only certain aspects of billboards and warts are important; others are irrelevant. (Gluckseberg, 1982), argue that certain "stock" metaphors such as "The pianist is a butcher", call forth a core of meaning from the lexicon that is used in different situations.

(Glucksberg, 1998) summarizes several lines of evidence that support the class inclusion model. It can account for the fact that metaphors are nonreversible. We can say that *my job is a jail* but it does not make sense to say *my jail is a job*. Moreover, if metaphor vehicles refer to abstract superordinate categories, then directing a person's attention to the more literal; basic-level meaning should disrupt comprehension. (Glucksberg, Manfredi & McGlone, 1997), gave people metaphors such as *My lawyer was a shark* preceded by neutral control sentences such as *Some tables are made of wood*, irrelevant topic property sentences such as *Some lawyers are married*), or irrelevant vehicle property sentences such as *Sharks can swim*. Participants took longer to comprehend metaphors when they were preceded by irrelevant property sentences than when preceded by irrelevant topic property or control sentences. Apparently, drawing a comprehender's attention to the more concrete aspects of a vehicle that is, *jails* as a place to hold prisoners interferes with our ability to comprehend it as a more abstract concept (that is, an unpleasant or confining place).

One of the attractive features of the class inclusion model is that we do not have to posit any special features to explain metaphor and figurative language. The treatment of figurative language emerges naturally from our understanding of how we access

the internal lexicon. According to (Glucksberg,1982), we understand metaphors much the way we understand literal speech-by retrieving information from the lexicon, selecting the part that is germane, and identifying a relationship between the lexical representations that have been retrieved. As (Caciari & Glucksberg, 1994), put it:

> **"Our claim is that the general principles underlying the comprehension… are applicable across literal-figurative distinction… the comprehension interpretive processes people use to understand language in discourse are common to literal and figurative language use (p.473).(ibid)**

The different types of figurative language enable us to communicate a wider range of meanings than would be possible if we were limited to literal language (Levin, 1977). Metaphors are primarily used to convey ideas and feelings that are difficult to express, and indirect speech acts are often employed to state a request in a polite way.

2.2 Biculturalism and its impact on the interlingual cognizance of metaphors

How culture might figure in the conceptual domain-to-domain mappings that characterise metaphor has gone largely unaddressed. On one hand, this is because anthropologists who study metaphor and who belong to the interpretivist school and its offshoots take the position that culture resides in metaphors as it does in other symbols-and not in the use and sense people make of these. These scholars draw on literary criticism, semiotics, structuralism and the like to interpret metaphors and other tropes (Linger, 1994).

On the other hand, the role of culture in the production and comprehension of metaphor tends to be crowded out of systematic consideration by linguists, many of whom, perhaps understandably, have treated the metaphors occurring in language as direct reflections of deeper conceptual structures. On grounds of the ubiquity and automaticity of metaphor in speech, (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) have made broad claims for the indispensable role of what they call "conceptual metaphors" in comprehension.

Cultural understandings govern metaphor use in two ways. Sometimes a given domain of experience is understood by analogy to another domain. Such an analogy and the extensive metaphorical language it provides may be culturally and historically quite distinctive. Yet the analogy may be so well established that it is naturalized in thinking; and the metaphors it provides have become standard parts of language, making it impossible but difficult, for those who have learned to conceptualize the world in this way to think and talk in any other forms (Reddy, 1979).

Therefore, if we are to achieve interlingual cognizance of metaphors, knowledge of underlying concepts in both cultures is very important. At the deeper or conceptual level, that is where the cultural world view rests. The subsequent linguistic expressions emerge from these deeper-seated concepts that later give birth to images across cultures.

2.2.1 Interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse

Socio-cultural characteristics can be said to be one of the typical translation problems a translator must resolve in translation – an activity of communication between different cultures.

The socio-cultural characteristics found in translation are of important significance in teaching translation as well. This is because these socio-cultural characteristics require a more active mediation by the translator, since the true meaning of the source text expressions cannot be delivered to the target language readers if translated literally (Bernadi, 1998). Research on socio-cultural characteristics also reveals that translation does not simply connect a language with another language or a text with another text but creates a dynamic relationship between various entities of writers and readers including the source text writers and readers. It should be borne in mind that, the history of translation of English and Luganda is short compared to other languages; and there has been little research in this area. Cultural research based on translation is expected to flourish through much future research.

Achieving interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse therefore; presupposes that one must have a fair formal exposure to both English and Luganda languages plus their stylistic and imagistic detail; needless to note, rooted within those two respective cultures.

To measure the effectiveness, efficiency and faithfulness vis a vis interlingual translatability of metaphorical expressions between English and Luganda, a comparative study of excerpts from **Things Fall Apart** Achebe should be made to establish whether the translator was not a traitor:

> **"Okonkwo was well known throughout the nine villages and even beyond. His fame rested on solid personal achievements. As a young man of eighteen he had brought honour to his village by throwing Amalinze the Cat. Amalinze was the great wrestler who for seven yrs was unbeaten, from Umofia to Mbaino. He was**

called the Cat because his back would never touch the earth. It was this man that Oknonkwo threw in a fight which the old man agreed was one of the fiercest since the founder of their town engaged a spirit of the wild for seven days and seven nights. The drums beat and the flutes sang and the spectators held their breath. Amalinze was a wily craftsman, but Okonkwo was as slippery as a fish in water. Every nerve and every muscle stood out on their arms, on their backs and their thighs, and one almost heard them stretching to breaking point. In the end Okonkwo threw the Cat. That was many yrs ago, twenty yrs or more, and during this time Okonkwo's fame had grown like a bush-fire in the harmattan. He was tall and huge, and his bushy eyebrows and wise nose gave him a very severe look. He breathed heavily, and it was said that, when he slept, his wives and children in their out-houses could hear him breathe. When he walked, his heels hardly touched the ground and he seemed to walk on springs, as if he was going to pounce on somebody. And he did pounce on people quite often. He had a slight stammer and whenever he was angry and could not get his words out quickly enough, he would use his fists. He had no patience with unsuccessful men. He had no patience with his father…….." (Achebe, 1958)

It is possible to suggest that the translated text below shares close analogies with the source text.As stated earlier, if the metaphorical images are universal, then there will be cultural parallels orchestrating a high degree of cognizance and the reverse will be true if there is a weak or no resemblance at all:

"Okonkwo yali mumanyifu mu byalo byonna omwenda ne mu miriraano gyabyo. Ettutumu lye lyamuviira mu ebyo bye yali akoze. Mu buvubuka bwe yayitimusa ekyalo kyaboobwe bweyalindiggula Amalinze, eyali akaziddwako erya Kkapa ennume y'ekigwo va omwange. Amalinze ye yali omumeganyi atawunyikamu. Eyali amalidde ddala emyaka omusanvu ng'enkoona ye tewunyisiddwa ku ttaka muntu yenna okuviira ddala e Umofia okutuuka e Mbaino. Ekyamukazisaako erya Kkapa lwa kuba nti ye eby'okutuusibwa ku ddimwa yali tamanyi kye bitegeeza. Ono ye muzira nnamige Okonkwo gw'atalabamu kantu bwe baayambalagana, musajja mukulu omu amale akakase nti kino ekigwo kyali kimu ku ebyo ebyasingira ddala okuba ggumbya bukya jjajjaabwe eyasimba omutala ogwo agwisa bwenyi n'omuzimu, bamale bakulungulire ddala ennungi musanvu emisana n'ekiro. Engoma zaasindogoma, n'emirere gyanyaanyagira era n'abalabi omukka ne bagumira. Amalinze yali mumeganyi mukujjukujju ekiyitiridde, kyoka nga Okonkwo aseerera nga kya kyannyanja mu mazzi. Buli Kasiwa na buli kaala kaabatunukayo ku mikono, ku migongo ne ku bisambi, nga kikulowoozesa nti ennereega gye beereeze ebasonjoleramu ddala wabiri. Bino okugenda okusirikka nga Okonkwo ekigwo yakimazeemu dda, Kkapa mugobe. Ebintu bino byaliwo dda, kati emyaka gyekulunze abiri n'omusobyo, kyoka mu myaka egye ettutumu lya Okonkwo lyatinta butaddirira, nga mpozzi bw'olaba oluyiira lw'ekyanda. Omanyi yali muwaguufu wa musituka;

ebisige bye ebijjuvu n'ennyindo ye endeeruufu nga ddala bimuwa entunula etiisa. Yassanga na maanyi, era abagerenjuzi baagambanga nti bwe yabanga yeebase bakazi be n'abaana baayimanga eyo mu nsiisira zaabwe ne bawulira bwayira. Bwe yatambulanga ng'ali ng'atambuza obunkenke, nga mpozzi ngalina gw'anabuukira. Ate ddala emirundi gye yabuukiranga abantu nga nagyo giwera. Yali munanagizemu, era kasita olulimi lwamwesibanga n'asikattira nga bikonde bye bimaliriza. Abo abantu engajaba nga tebamutwalira biseera bye era mu abo nga mwazingira ne kitaawe…."(ibid)

The translator above somewhat endeavoured to paint a remarkably similar image of the message from the source language to the target language. He used several metaphors in Luganda to clearly communicate meanings from the source text for instance, **okulindiggula Kkapa ennume y'ekiggwo** (metaphorical, for throwing Amalinze the cut down like one would a very big tree), **emirere gyanyaanyaagira** (metaphorical, for flutes sang, resonating the air with dulcet melodies). Nevertheless, there are great contrasts, obvious exaggerations and direct translations attributed to his failure to access corresponding cultural images, for instance, he directly translated **as slippery as fish in water** as **aseerera nga kyannyanja mu mazzi,** culturally though, it should have better translated as **aseerera nga nziziri, the spectators held their breath** was directly transalated as era **abalabi omukka ne bagumira,** this does not culturally make sense, it should instead have translated into **Bbo batamukute….. n'ebesuunga okulaba ani ateeka munne ku ddimwa etc.**

58

2.2.2 Determining utterance equivalences in interlingual translation

The many and varied pitfalls, problems of interlingual translation are ones which linguists and anthropologists, among others, have long faced and sought solution to. The literature dealing with the nature of meaning, cultural symbols, language communication and their implications for translation is extensive and generally of high quality (Brower, 1959; Casagrande, 1954; Malinowski, 1923; Morris, 1946; Osgood et al. 1957; Phillips, 1959; Voegelin, 1954). While the literature impresses one with the complexities involved in understanding meaning-stylistic, syntactic, semiotic, and semantic and pragmatic- one is at a loss to find the wisdom of this understanding operationalised as field techniques usable in the task of obtaining cultural imagistic data in both local and exotic languages through which one must work.

The criterion for an adequate translation suggested here and elsewhere (Rabin, 1958; Quine, 1959; Jalobsen, 1959) is to render an utterance in a second language such that it evokes the same, or nearly similar as possible, a set of ideas, concepts, emotive reactions, sememes- call them what you will- in native speakers of the second language as the original utterance does amongst the native speakers of the first language. Any two utterances which, in some specified context, gloss or imply always and only some one experience or event will be by definition "equivalent".

2.2.3 Effect of L1 on competence levels in metaphors in discourse

Since metaphor is pervasive in everyday language, the ability to comprehend and produce metaphor is quite important in the teaching and learning of a language. This section aims at contributing to the mounting evidence provided by a wide range of

studies conducted to prove the effectiveness of the mother tongue in explaining competence levels in understanding, translation and use of metaphors discourse.

In his analysis of the benefits and risks of the effects of mother tongue knowledge on the interpretation of figurative expressions, the findings of (Masumi, 2007) showed in a broad sense, knowledge of the mother tongues was effective to a degree in the interpretations of the expressions (even though they were unfamiliar to them). In the University of Toronto (Danesi, 1992) conducted a research on metaphor and classroom second language learning. The results of this research project showed that non-native speakers of Italian were much less successful than their native-speaker counterparts in interpreting and translating metaphors in Italian. In that same article,(Ibid) also reported on comparable results for a similar study carried out with students enrolled in a Spainish program (Ibid).

(Deignan, Gabrys and Solska (1997 cited by Cecilie, 2014) conducted a study where they investigated the levels of difficulty prevailing in the comprehension of expressions that shared conceptual metaphors in English and L1. Based on the results, they concluded that most learners would experience difficulties in making sense of a metaphorical expression in English if they did not have an equivalent conceptual metaphor in the L1. Similarly, (Boers & Demecheleer, 1999 cited by Cecilie, 2014), through their study on the use of French idioms with similar and different English idioms, found out that if the ways in which the source domains of metaphorical expressions are used in the students' L1 are different from the English source domains, problems in comprehension most likely arise.

(Golden, 2005) study investigated 15-year-old Norwegian students' comprehension of metaphorical expressions in school books of Norwegian pupils' metaphor

comprehension. The results showed a gap in comprehension between the linguistic minority students and those with Norwegian as their mother tongue. The minority students were found to understand considerably less than the students with Norwegian as their mother tongue. (Golden's, 2005) findings are supported by (Kulbrandstad's, 1998) who studied the comprehension of the metaphorical expression among a group of minority students. According to (Kulbrandstad's, 1998), elements such as metaphorical expressions pose a challenge when it comes to mastering a foreign language. Most of the students knew the meaning of the word a medal, but were unable to read beyond a literal interpretation of the word as used in medaljens bakside. Similar findings were also reported by (Deignan, Gabrýs and Solska, 1997) who compared metaphors in first and target language and found the first language to be effective in improving learners' metaphor comprehension and production. (Cook, 2001) in support of the role of L1 states that bringing the L1 back from exile may lead not only to the improvement of existing teaching methods but also to innovations in methodology. Furthermore, Brooks and (Donato, 1994 cited in Cook, 2001) argue that the use of mother tongue is a normal psycholinguistic process that facilitates L2 production and allows the learners both to initiate and sustain verbal interaction with one other.

In another study, (Shahin and Mehdi, 2010) examined the effect of using translation from L1 to L2 as a teaching technique on the improvement of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners' linguistic accuracy focus on form. Seventy two pre-intermediate learners were chosen by means of administering an achievement test. This test, which also functioned as the pre-test, was designed in a way that the participants who did not have familiarity with the four aimed structures of this study,

i.e. *Passive voice, Indirect reported speech, Conditional type 2,* and *Wish plus simple past*, were identified. Based on the pretest, the experimental and comparison groups were formed. The experimental group underwent the treatment, that is, translating Persian sentences into English using the newly learned structures. Nonetheless, the comparison group received the placebo—grammar exercises in the course book. Both groups were posttested through another achievement test. The results of the post-test—through *t*-test analysis—demonstrated that the experimental group outperformed the comparison group in terms of accuracy. It is concluded that this technique can be used by teachers to reinforce new structures.

In a previous investigation Azuma's (2005 cited by Masumi, 2007) analysis demonstrated that cultural elements generated from the mother tongue (Japanese, in this case) were significantly related to the understanding of English metaphorical expressions in the case of Japanese students who learned English as a foreign language (EFL, hereafter). The study showed the strong correlation between EFL students' knowledge of English vocabulary and their metaphorical competence (ibid), and it indicated that the issue of metaphor and culture would be a new focal point.

In one of the most recent studies (Aintzane, 2013) examined the role of metaphors in the acquisition of figurative vocabulary by learners of English in two contexts, an EFL classroom and a CLIL classroom. Results showed that, compared to the traditional translation-based approach, systematic presentation of the target figurative expressions on anger around the two conceptual metaphors improves comprehension and spontaneous retention of the target vocabulary. (Jabak's, 2005) results obtained from the t-test analysis showed that using translation from L1 to L2 improves the linguistic accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. According to him, translation from L1 to

L2 as a teaching technique plays a major role in improving learners' linguistic accuracy.

In his work on Conceptual errors in second-language learning (Danesi, 2008), indicates that deficiency or insufficient metaphoric competence may impair learners' receptive and productive skills in the FL. He (Danesi, 2008) cites some studies that have shown that learners who are unable to understand 17% of the metaphor related words in texts with a metaphor density of 11.7% will have problems understanding the text without external help. In order to arouse Chinese English teachers' attention to metaphor instruction, Qian, (Liang & Yanqing, 2014) carried out an empirical investigation of the relationship between the receptive metaphoric competence and reading proficiency of Chinese learners of English. The outcomes of their study showed that the scores of receptive metaphoric competence were positively and significantly correlated with their reading proficiency.

(Teymouri and Hamidreza, 2014) investigated the possible relationship between Iranian EFL learners' metaphoric competence (MC) and their language proficiency. As a practical issue, and in the hope of laying the groundwork for a better understanding and addressing MC in the EFL classroom, the metaphorical competence of 60 male and female Iranian EFL students was assessed; and the scores on OPT were used to evaluate their general English language proficiency. The results revealed that, the participants' language proficiency is positively correlated with their MC. The study thus concluded that participants with higher language proficiency are more metaphorically competent as well. In Csábi's study (2004), learners who were exposed to metaphor-awareness instruction outperformed their peers in comprehension and retention of the polysemous verbs *hold* and *keep*.

From the empirical evidence derived in this section of the literature, one can conclude that the mother-tongue plays a role in explaining the competency levels in understanding, translating under use of metaphors in the teaching and learning process whether it is positive, neutral or negative. Although many researchers have made valuable contribution in this area, a closer look at most of the studies shows that they largely focus on other countries and therefore much less is known with respect to Uganda. In the Ugandan context no empirical study, to the best of the researcher's knowledge has been conducted in Uganda to determine analyze the role of L1 in the figurative language used in the teaching of languages in Ugandan secondary schools. It was for this reason that this study set out to find out to study this phenomenon in order to provide a more thorough analysis and then provide pertinent recommendations

2.2.4 Enhancing a bilingual's metaphoric cognizance

This section looks at the ways how metaphorical cognizance can be enhanced in both English and Luganda Languages.

We all know that the main function of language is communication. However, we seldom know that the crucial function of language is to provide identity (Kirkpatrick, 2005). According to (Le Page, 1964), while communication is an obvious function of language, the primary function of language is to allow people to act as members of a speech community. When we communicate with people in English as a second or foreign language, the English we use reveals which sort of cultural group we come from. To be more specific, the English we use reveals our cultural and social identity.

The English we use reveals who we are, just like our first language does. The way we pronounce the words, the way we organize sentences, and so on all allow the people with whom we are interacting to know who we are. When Americans speak English, they sound American, when Australians speak English they sound Australian. Likewise, when Baganda speak English they sound Kiganda and when the British or Americans speak Luganda they sound British or American. When we speak a second or foreign language, we not only reveal who we are in terms of pragmatic norms or conventions. That is, we transfer the pragmatic norms or conventions of our first language to the use of English, for example, as a second language, as a lingua franca. However, (Kirkpatrick, 2005) points out that while it is easy to learn that different cultures use different forms of greeting, it can be much more difficult to learn that different cultures have different pragmatic norms in many other fields, such as requesting and receiving compliments.

It is just as important that, in turn, the norms or conventions underlying our behaviour can in one way or another help unpack our culture. Through understanding how people from different cultures communicate with each other, how people verbally perform the act of invitation, for example, we may likely come to know how politeness as an important norm operates in the interpersonal communication in the Kiganda context. More than that,the norms or conventions of politeness may help us know some aspects of Kiganda culture as the norm of politeness in the Kiganda context stems the **Ganda** maxim or what may be called propriety in English. **Ganda** in fact constitutes an important aspect of the Kiganda brotherly culture that underlies the Kiganda interpersonal relationship and interaction as a bundle or unit of inseparable people living together in love, respect and harmony.

Communication is a symbolic system and symbols have meaning only in relation to cultural and social environment. Thus communication including language as social and cultural act cannot be studied in isolation.Communication itself is culture and culture is communication. It is part of cultural values and beliefs. Culture in terms of values and beliefs, etc does enter into face-to-face (intercultural) communication to create:

> **"an international space in which the subconscious and automatic sociolinguistic (pragmatic, the author) processes of interpretation and inference can a variety of outcomes and make interpretations subject to question" (Gumperz, 1982).**

In such an intercultural encounter, our most cherished expectations, assumptions and ways of thinking cannot travel across cultural boundaries. What is customarily expected and understood becomes incomprehensible in a diverse culture. Therefore, communication cannot be studied as value-free phenomenon, and as cultural and social act, it must be looked at as a product of the interplay of culture and social realities or pragmatic conventions.

Communication can be defined as a culturally constructed act because it is not only influenced by but also enacts cultural values, beliefs, and cultural and social conventions. Or stated differently, the differing cultural values, beliefs, worldviews in one way or another impose different or conventions for the use of language or other modes of communication in comparable social situational context. They are enacted in a variety of manners of communication as noted below:

**"Thus, the norms and values and values which inform speakers'
knowledge as to what is appropriate to say to whom, and under
which conditions show considerable variation from community to
community around the world, not only from one language group
to another but within language groups as well" (Wolfson, 1989).**

So what we do and how in intercultural communication may to a different extent;
reveal significant differences of identity in terms of values and beliefs because values
values and beliefs themselves are constitutive of communicative reality.

However, the interlocutors in the course of intercultural communication are
expressing these differences without their realizing of doing so-they are not aware of
them. They are enacting these differences in a natural manner. It is just this
unawareness of being ourselves and acting according to our deepest instincts, human
beings reveal fundamental differences in what we all tend to think of as normal
behaviour.

2.2.4 Research questions

The research questions that will guide the study are:

1. What does understanding a metaphor entail?

2. Does familiarity with the use of metaphors in one language guarantee equal
familiarity with their use in another language?

3. How can a bilingual's communicative competence be enhanced in the interlingual
cognizance of metaphors?

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0   Introduction

This chapter examines the methodology in which the research design, instruments, procedures and methods of data analysis used in the study are explained.

3.1   Research design

The study was carried out using a cross-sectional research design to investigate the interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse in both English and Luganda by bilingual teachers in lower secondary school in government – aided secondary schools of Busiro County in Wakiso district. The cross-sectional research design was appropriate because extensive data could be collected at one point in time and it was economical (Amin, 2005). The design was also appropriate because data could be collected from a particular section of the population in a short period of time and then results generalized to represent the entire population of the study (ibid).

3.2   Study area

The research was carried out in fourteen government-aided secondary schools located in Busiro County in Wakiso district. This area was selected because it has a good concentration of bilingual teachers of English and Luganda given its location in the central part of Uganda. Secondly, English and Luganda languages are taught in the majority of these schools.

3.3   Population and sample

The study population constituted lower secondary school teachers of English, English and Luganda and Luganda only in public schools of Busiro County in Wakiso district. The total population constituted 85 teachers and its from this number that the sample size was derived using (Morgan & Krejcies's,1970) Table of sample determination for different population sizes as cited by (Amin, 2005,p.454). From this Table, the sample size corresponding to a population of 85 is 70. Thus, the findings reported in this study are based on a total of 70 teachers selected from 14 schools that were sampled. Table 3.1 gives a summary the breakdown of the number of teachers selected from each school.And for ethical considerations, the sampled public schools shall be replaced with appellations of alphabetical letters.

Table 3.1: Population and corresponding sample sizes

School	Population	Sample size
A	5	4
B	8	7
C	5	4
D	2	2
E	3	2
F	3	2
G	9	7
H	5	4
I	5	4
J	9	7
K	10	9
L	11	10
M	7	6
N	3	2
Total	85	70

3.4 Sampling technique

Since the study was targeting a specific category of teachers from a vast population, purposive sampling was used to get the sample of from the fourteen schools as it allowed the researcher to include subjects with specific needed information. This is

supported by (Kothiari, 2004) and (Amin, 2005) who argued that purposive sampling enables a researcher in selecting only those respondents that possess the required information. The study aimed at identifying teachers who are true bilinguals. These were believed to have sufficient knowledge of the study under investigation and thus would provide the required information. In other words, these respondents were deemed to be true bilinguals of both English and Luganda languages and they were also selected because they teach in schools where English and Luganda are taught as languages on the school curriculum. The purposive sampling technique was equally used because it economizes time and specific information can be obtained at a much reduced cost and time (Kothiari, 2004).

The number of sampled respondents from the fourteen schools is different because they possess different numbers of language teachers. Thus, due to the heterogeneous nature of the population in the sampled schools, the researcher used stratified random sampling where from each sub population; a proportionate sample was obtained in order to ensure that all schools are fairly represented in the study. Random sampling was then used because of the advantage it has in avoiding bias in that each member in the target population has an equal opportunity of being chosen (Amin, 2005).

3.5   Research instruments

3.5.1   The tests

In order to measure participants' proficiency in intralingual and interlingual cognizance of metaphors in the selected experiential domains (that is: cognizance of metaphors, translatability of metarphors and use of metaphors in discourse) in both English and Luganda; the test was the research instrument that was employed in data collection. This was deemed to be the most apt instrument of data collection in this

study, which was structured and self-administered (see Appendices A and B). The rationale was to study the relationship between teachers' English/luganda proficiency and their figurative language competence. Accordingly, the researcher constructed two tests for the teachers in the selected schools. These structured tests were administered to the teachers whose responses on the interlingual cognizance of metaphors were obtained. Structured tests are simple to administer and relatively cheaper to analyze (Kothiari, 2004). The test was also preferred as the one and only instrument in this study because it is easy to use on a larger number of subjects.

3.6   Test layout

The first test was in English (Appendix A) while the second was in Luganda (Appendix B). Teachers were given ninety minutes to complete each of the two tests. The scoring of the tests was as follows: Section A was marked out of 30 while sections B and C were each marked out of 10. At the beginning, the tests required the participants to provide some background data which included: their L1 (Either English or Luganda), Level of formal linguistic exposure (Diploma, Degree masters), languages taught (English only, Luganda only or both) and Teaching experience. This information was important in determining whether there was any significant relationship between intralingual and interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse and each of the aforementioned variables. Appendix G presents a summary of the raw scores obtained from marking.

Three experiential domains of English and Luganda were selected. These domains are: Love Is a Journey Metaphor, Beauty Metaphors, And Rule and Governance Metaphors. They were selected on grounds that they are the most common concepts,

near people's reality, more perceptive and exciting. Participants were given pairs of sentences for which they had to:

A i). Select sentences with metaphoric ideas from literal ones. The selection of sentences containing images and metaphorical key ideas illustrated the respondents' comprehension of metaphors in discourse.

   ii). Identify the common metaphorical idea out of the ten selected sentences.

B. Show the interlingual translatability of metaphors and the challenges involved. They were given three texts full of metaphorical expressions- Section B; texts A, B and C.

   In their translations, the respondents gave the following renditions for their corresponding metaphor for *I love you my gentle one*: *Kabiite*, *Nabutono*, *eky'ebbeyi kyange*, *omulungi omuteefu* which proves that there is no single word to go round a metaphorical translation from English into Luganda and the reverse. Langauge will provide a wide range of possibilities that the image behind the linguistic expressions can offer.

   I therefore arrived at my model translation after considering all the likely linguistic expressions that the cultural image behind them can corroborate.

C. The respondents were given an idea of discourse in two texts- text A had metaphorical expressions and text B had literal expressions. The idea was to identify how an individual's communicative competence could be enhanced in the interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse.The above steps were taken for triangulation purposes.

3.7 The validity and reliability of the test

3.7.1 Validity

The validity of the research instrument was ensured by assessing the items in the test in the process of its construction. The questions were discussed with the supervisor before giving them to two independent lecturers from the Institute of Languages, Makerere University for verification. This was to clear any lack of clarity and ambiguity. The content related validity of the test was determined by giving the questions to two different and independent lecturers from the Institute of Languages, Makerere University. These lecturers examined them to assess the relevance of the questions with the objectives of the study and the content validity index was computed. The formula for validity is indicated below;

$$\text{Content Validity Index (CVI)} = \frac{\text{No. of items rated relevant}}{\text{Total No. of items rated irrelevant.}}$$

The content validity index was calculated basing on the different sections of the tests. Appendix A, section A had 30 valid items, section B had three valid texts and section C had two valid texts with twelve valid statements. Appendix B, section A had 30 valid items, section B had three valid texts and section C had two valid texts with 12 valid statements. The results were 0.82 indicating that the instrument was valid. This supported by (Amin, 2005), who stated that, for any instrument to be accepted as valid, the average index should be 0.7 and above. Since the index value was 0.82, this meant that, the items of the instrument were proved valid.

3.7.2 Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistence of the research instruments. For the test, the researcher carried out a Test-Retest method where a respondent who had sat for the

73

test was asked to sit it again after two weeks and his/ her responses compared for consistence. According to (Amin, 2005), test-retest or stability test provides evidence that the scores obtained on a test at one time (test) are the same or close to the same when the test is re-administered some time later (re-test). For consistence of research results from the study instruments, the researcher used Cronbach Coefficient alpha to determine the reliability of the instrument. The formula is indicated below:

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K-1}\left(1 - \frac{\sum SD_i^2}{SD_t^2}\right)$$

α = is the Alpha Coefficient of Correlation.

K = is the number of items in the instruments.

SD_t^2 = ^{variance} of the scores on the total test.

SD_i^2 = ^{variance} of scores on individual items

Σ = Summation

A pilot study was conducted in two schools; Lubiri Secondary School and Mengo Senior School that were not part of the sample of 15 Schools and 20 teachers were selected as respondents. The collected data was coded and entered into the computer using an SPSS program. Reliability was thereafter computed and the following were the results: Section A's, $\alpha = 0.75$, section B1's $\alpha = 0.83$, B2's $\alpha = 0.83$, B3's $\alpha = 0.83$ and section C's $\alpha = 0.75$. According to (Amin, 2005), a perfect reliable instrument has a coefficient alpha of 1.00, meaning that all values close to 100 are reliable. According also to Kothiari (2004), if 10-20 items are used, the minimum reliability value should be between 0.6-0.80. Since over the required items were used and their values were above 0.6, therefore the instruments were proved reliable. The researcher

chose the above formula because according to (Gay, 1996), the formula requires less time than any other methods of estimating reliability.

3.8   Research procedure

When the data collecting instruments were ready after validating and testing their reliability, the researcher got a letter of introduction from the Director Institute of Languages, Faculty of Arts, Makerere University (Appendix E). This was presented to the head teachers of the schools indicated in the sample. Upon being granted permission to carry out the study, the researcher also sought the consent of teachers. The tests were administered in the first two months of the study in July 2010. Two tests were administered to a sample of 70 teachers. These tests were administered at two different intervals of 30 minutes after the other. After the respondents had fully responded to the questions, the tests were collected and returned-acceptable for analysis by the researcher.

3.9 Data analysis

Data was coded and entered in the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) computer program for analysis. To delve into the purposes of the study, certain statistical procedures were utilized to analyze and interpret the data elicited by the study. The main statistical procedure employed in this study was a t-test. This test was used because the study aimed at determining whether there are significance mean differences between teachers' mother tongue and their level of cognizance, translatability and the use of metaphors in discourse. Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) was also another test used and this was employed because the researcher wanted to establish how respondents background information (such as teaching experience,

taught language, level of exposure to the two languages) relate with the average scores on teachers' cognizance, translatability and the use of metaphors in discourse. The presentation and discussion of the results is done in the fourth chapter.

3.10 Problems encountered

A lot of teachers were apprehensive and had an unfounded resentment towards scholarship. The researcher found it difficult to convince teachers to sit for the tests. A great number of them thought the study was a profitable venture and ended up asking for money to sit for the tests. This constrained and drained the researcher's finances in such scenarios where the respondents were not willing to freely give a hand. Therefore, this inevitably had to delay the process of writing and submitting the final report.

Many government-aided secondary schools are not easily accessible by taxi. On several occasions the researcher had to incur motorcycle fare costs to access such schools and this became a very big strain on the researcher's meager resources.

Several research tests were wasted by the respondents who got excited first before opening the research booklets to study the content. This was a very big disappointment on the part of the researcher in terms of printing costs- the time wasted and effort to say the least.

Non availability of literature was a problem brought about by the scarcity of the books pertaining to this topic in the university library. However, the internet provided a great deal of information.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

4.0   Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis and interpretation of the data from the tests administered to teachers. The chapter first resents some background information of the teachers that participated in this study. This is then followed by the findings arising from the research questions cited in the first chapter of this thesis.

4.1. Teachers' background information

In the background information that was solicited, teachers were asked to mention their L1, teaching experience and the languages they were teaching. Owing to the fact that teachers level of education has an important role in explaining competency levels teaching, teachers' level of exposure to English and Luganda was also other information sought from the participants in this research. Table 4.0 presents a summary of the findings.

Table 4.0: Teachers' background information

Variable	Response	Frequency	Percent
First language(L1)	English	7	10.0%
	Luganda	63	90.0%
Teaching experience	1-5 years	29	41.4%
	6-10 years	26	37.1%
	16-20 years	9	12.9%
	Above 20 years	6	8.6%
Taught languages	English only	33	47.1%
	Luganda only	27	38.6%
	Both	10	14.3%
Level of English/Literature in English exposure	Diploma	3	5.9%
	Degree	45	88.2%
	Post graduate diploma	3	5.9%
Level of Luganda exposure	Diploma	17	54.8%
	Degree	14	45.2%

As noted in the previous chapter, the total number of participants selected from the fourteen schools was seventy (70) teachers. From this number, the largest proportion (90%) had Luganda as their L1 while those whose first language was English constituted the smallest propttion (10%). This is understandable in view of the fact that the study was carried out in the central region where Luganda is the first language for majority of the people in this region. Surprisingly, most of these teachers 33 (47.1%) were teaching English only while those that specialized in Teaching only

Luganda were 27 (38.6%). Only 10 (14.3%) teachers were teaching both Luganda and English in their respective schools.

In relation to teaching experience, a fairly large proportion of the participants (41.4%) had taught for less than six years and these were closely followed by those that had taught for 6-10 years. Teachers whose teaching experience was 16-20 and above 20 years were each represented by 12.9% and 8.6% respectively.

With regard to the level of exposure to English/Literature in English, the study found out that more than three quarters 45 (88.2%) of the participants in this research were holders of a Bachelors degree. Three participants had a post graduate diploma and the same number had obtained a Diploma as their higherest level of exposure to English/Literature in English exposure. Turning to the level of Luganda exposure, more than 50 percent of the teachers had a diploma as their highest level of exposure to this language. Those whose level of training was a bacherlors degree were represented by 45.2 percent. This finding shows that although Luganda happens to be the first language to majority of the people in the central region, this language appears to be unattractive to be pursued at higher levels by most of the students.

4.2   Data for Test Question One: What it entails to understand metaphors in discourse

This research question explored the use of metaphorical expressions in discourse. To answer the above question, the researcher administered a test to teachers to assess how far they were interlingually cognizant with metaphors. The aim was to determine if there were significant differences on the test between the scores for teachers whose first language was English and those whose L1 was Luganda. The analysis was based on the results of the two tests which were marked out of 30 (Appendix A and B). The

analsysis considered the performance of the respondents in relation to the influence of mother tongue as the main variable in the interlingual cognizance of metaphors in English and Luganda. The findings are summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Teachers performance on the interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse based on first language

	L1	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig.
Interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse (English)	English	7	20.0	9.5	3.402	.039
	Luganda	63	15.2	6.7		
	Total	70	15.9	6.9		
Interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse (Luganda)	English	7	23.0	6.9	5.170	.008
	Luganda	63	15.8	8.2		
	Total	70	16.8	8.5		

From the t-test table, the average performance of teachers whose L1 happens to be English is higher than that of their counterparts whose L1 is Luganda. Specifically, the analysis shows that when a teacher's L1 is English, her/his average level of interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse in English is 20 while that of their Luganda counterparts is 15.2 and the differences in the two averages were statistically significant (0.039 < 0.05). Similarly, the average score on cognizance of metaphors in discourse in Luganda is 23 for teachers whose first language is English while 15.8 was the score for those whose L1 is Luganda and the differences in the two means were also highly significant (0.008 < 0.05). This implies that if one's L1 is English,

this enhances her/his understanding of metaphorical use of language in discourse in both English and Luganda.

Other background characteristics were also assumed to have an influence on understanding of metaphorical use of language in discourse. These included: taught language, exposure to both languages and teaching experience. A summary of the results is given in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Teachers performance on the interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse based on other bio-data of the teachers

Variable	Cognizance of metaphors in	Attribute	N	Mean	F	Sig.
Taught language	English	English only	33	17.2	1.533	0.223
		Luganda only	27	14.1		
		Both	10	16.3		
	Luganda	English only	33	18.6	1.563	0.217
		Luganda only	27	15.1		
		Both	10	14.9		
Level of Luganda exposure	English	Diploma	3	20	0.442	0.645
		Degree	45	16.3		
		PGD	3	15		
	Luganda	Diploma	3	23	1.063	0.354
		Degree	45	17.2		
		PGD	3	21		
Level of English exposure	English	Diploma	17	13.2	1.182	0.286
		Degree	14	16		
	Luganda	Diploma	17	13.6	0.537	0.47
		Degree	14	16.1		
Experience	English	1-5 years	29	13.7	2.238	0.092
		6-10 years	26	17.6		
		16-20 years	9	15.2		
		> 20 years	6	19.7		
	Luganda	1-5 years	29	16.2	0.255	0.857
		6-10 years	26	17.7		
		16-20 years	9	17.2		
		> 20 years	6	14.8		

The findings show that teachers whose teaching subject is English on average had higher scores in understanding metaphors used in English (mean = 17.2) and Luganda (mean = 18.6). In the same vein, participants who were teaching both subjects had a better undertsnading of metaphors used in English (mean = 16.3) but when it comes to the metaphors used in Luganda, the repondents whose teaching subject was Luganda only, perfomed better (mean = 15.1). However, evidence derived from the analysis indicated that language taught hardly plays a significantly vital role in explaining teachers' undertnading of the use of metaphors since all p-values (0.223 and 0.217) were above 0.05 level of significance.

In relation to exposure to Luganda, the findings in this study appeared to be in contrast with the researcher postulation that level of exposure enhances teachers understanding of interlingual cognizance of metaphors. Although insignificant ($p > 0.05$) holders of a Diploma in Luganda had higher averages (mean = 20) than those with higher qualifications. However, in relation to Exposure to English, higher exposure appeared to positively influence teachers understanding of the metaphors although not to a statistically significant extent ($p > 0.05$). Similarly teaching experience was positively related with understanding of metaphors in discourse used in English and Luganda. That is, an increase in the teaching experience was found to enhance interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse. Nonetheless, this relationship was also statistically insignificant since all p-values were above the level of significance (0.05).

The findings from Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show that understanding metaphorical use of language in discourse is only dependent on the mother tongue. And going by the

revelation in Table 4.1, it can be suggested that English as a mother tongue makes positive contributions to teachers' success in understanding metaphors in discourse. Put differently English as a mother tongue puts one at a higher advantage when it comes to interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse in both English and Luganda. This contention is supported by the interpretation of the text, entitled **I love you my**, **gentle one.** The best respondent in the test whose L1 was English had the rendition below:

"**Nkwagala nyo (sic) kabiite wange, nkwagala nyo (sic) kabite wange**

Onsula kumutwe ngaviri (sic) omukwano gwange munyenye

Gyosooka okulaba ng'ozukuse, omukwano gwange gulinga akasana

Kukumakya (sic) gukuletera akabugumirize wenna n'obugumirira

Ye nkukwekewa nze ewatali bansaalwa. Abakulabako bamukisa.

Buli akulabako nakyamukirira, oli kimuli kya roza ekiwunya akalosa.

Buli lwenkukubako ekimunye omutima gwange negutyemuka

Amameeme (sic) negankubagana, gwe olina ekisumuluzo

Kyomutima gwange

Nkwagala nnyo kabite wange"

On account of the fact that the respondent above shows a thorough grasp of the concept of beauty and the cultural imagery underpinning the linguistic expressions in both English and Luganda, the possibility of scoring nine marks out of ten was then realized on indisputable grounds that one had to derive their linguistic expressions from the accurate cultural imagery behind concepts. This therefore renders metaphorical cognizance to be a concept that is not automatic in discourse but rather a teachable phenomenon.

Conversely, as to the interpretation of the same text one respondent - a teacher whose L1 was Luganda showed very little grasp of the cultural imagery behind concepts but rather tended to translate linguistic expressions and consequently ended up being a direct translator-showing very minimal cognizance as illustrated below:

"Nkwagala, omugonvu wange, nkwagala nnyo omugonvu wange

Okwagala kwange g'emata ag'omurubindi gewanywa ku lunaku lwe'mbaga

Okwagala gwe muzigo ogwatusigibwa okussaako ekifundikwa mu mitima gyaffe

Oli ggi kuba abakulaba bagagga oli kitoogo ky'omu nyanja

Ekikulibwayo emikono gyombi, era nkuyimbira nga nkaaba, nsinda

Kuba omutima gwange gugwo

Nkwagala omugonvu"

The respondent above lacks knowledge that underneath the linguistic expressions as to beauty, there are cultural images that motivate the utterances. It is therefore little wonder that the translation lacks faithfulness from the source language to the target language and the feelings and mood the text arouses in English are far different from those in the Luganda translation prompting him to get four marks out of ten. This suggests therefore, that the teachers of Luganda and English ought to be taught and also teach students that the metaphorical expressions are not ad hoc. They can be taught like any other linguistic concept. Cultural depth across languages is the first tenet and canon to put under consideration

4.3   Data from the Test Question Two: The interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse

This section discusses the performance of teachers in relation to the interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse. In the second objective, the aim was to determine whether the L1 can support, fail to support or actively hinder someone from translating metaphors from the first language to the second language or from the second language to the first one. The aim was to determine whether linguistic accuracy in translating metaphors is statistically dependent on L1. This is because, as Swan (2008) asserts, each native language has trained its speakers to pay different kinds of attention to events and experiences when translating. The assumption was based on Lado's (1957) assertion that a teacher who comes in contact with a second language will find some features of it quite difficult. In contrast, those elements that are similar to his/her mother tongue are likely to be simple. The results of this analysis are based on the scores obtained in section B of the two tests and was marked out of 10. The result of the *t*-test that compares participants' performance for the two tests is shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Effect of L1 on the interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse

	L1	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse (English)	English	7	4.7	2.3	.284	.754
	Luganda	63	3.6	2.5		
	Total	70	3.7	2.5		
Interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse	English	7	2.7	1.2	1.141	.326
	Luganda	63	3.5	1.8		

(Luganda)	Total	70	3.4	1.8		

Despite the insignificant results, a key point to note in Table 4.3 is that the first language affects a teacher's translatability of metaphors in his/her mother tongue. For example, teachers whose first language was English perfomed better in translating metaphors in English. However, when it came to translating metaphors in Luganda, participants whose L1 is Luganda perfomed better, a finding which renders credence with Lado's (1957) affirmation. The finding appear to suggest that on the linguistic level, translation into the first language provides the translator with some advantages of his or her L1 because she/he acquires these linguistic elements naturally in the course of time. This argument is in collaboration with (Jabak, 2005) who believes that translators are better at translating into their native language than into a second language. In his wisdom, the underlying reason for this assumption is that translators have a more profound linguistic and cultural background of their L1 than of a second language which they have to learn in order to be well-versed translators. Additionally, the translator who translates into his or her native language has a more natural and practical knowledge of the various linguistic elements of his or her native language. In fact, the translators' first language is naturally acquired in a culture and environment where the first language is naturally acquired and practiced. On the other hand, their second language is, for the most part, learned, rather than acquired, later on in the course of their life. As a result, the linguistic and cultural knowledge of their second language is always in progress and never complete (Jabak, 2005).

In view of the statistical insignificance between the two languages and translatability of metaphors, one concludes that both categories of teachers face the the same

ease/difficulties when it comes to translating metaphors from one language to another. One respondent encountered the following difficulties associated with the translation of the text from English to Luganda:

> **"It wasn't easy to get the Luganda equivalents of the metaphors expressed in the English poem. Trying to get the exact translation tended to dilute the depth of the emotions expressed by the poet. Again introducing metaphors that were far from those in the text tended to exaggerate the thoughts, feelings and mood of the poet".**

The respondent argues that regardless of one's L1, there will always be very serious hurdles associated with interlingual translatability of metaphors. The same respondent made the following remarks vis a vis the difficulties associated with the translation of the text from Luganda to English:

> **"Translating the poem required time and careful analytical thought about the whole poem and individual lines".**

However, the respondent displayed a good degree of competence when translating the text.

Another respondent realized, concerning the translation of the text from Luganda to English:

> **"The Luganda text was too wordy and could not be followed to the letter. It was also so repetitive and tended towards boring. The Luganda text exaggerated the beauty of Mirembe. Such beauty does not exist in the real world. So, while translating, I had to**

overcome the exaggerations and repetitiveness that would dilute the English text"

The statement implies that the respondent encountered difficulties while translating the text notwithstanding their somewhat good performance.

The same respondent moreover points out that:

"The translation was quite easy because the metaphors used exist in our real world situation. Some of the examples are so current vivid. Secondly, it was so close to the biblical portrait of a messianic king in Isaiah 9, 11 and 42. Any serious Christian and reader of the Jewish scriptures would find it easy."

The views above buttress (Kamugisha's, 2001), (Gumperz, 1972) and (Trudgill's, 1988) observations that there are linguistic constraints associated with interlingual translatability of metaphors. Communication therefore, is not just an exchange of ideas but rather a socially meaningful episode in which language plays a part as emphasized by Austin's (ibid) speech act theory. For this reason (Jabak, 2005) emphasizes that because of cultural issues, translation into the first language provides the translator with an in-depth knowledge of the various aspects of his or her culture because most texts are normally coloured with cultural elements such as idioms, proverbs, metaphors and other cultural features. Thus, when a teacher translate into his/her native language and culture, he/she is fully aware of the cultural sensitivities of the target language and can best render the cultural elements of the source language into proper equivalents in his/her own language and culture. On the other hand, the translator who translates into a foreign language and culture may not be able to see and recognize the cultural aspects of the foreign or second language because he or she

is an alien to that culture no matter how many cultural references or phrases he or she memorizes.

Still on interlingual translatability the researcher also examined whether performance of teachers on the interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse is dependent on other background information of the participants. These included: language taught, level of exposure to English and Luganda and teaching experience. The findings are given in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Teachers performance on Interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse based on other bio-data of the teachers

Variable	Interlingual translatability of metaphors in:	Attribute	N	Mean	F	p-value
Taught language	English	English only	29	4.4	3.039	0.055
		Luganda only	25	2.8		
		Both	9	3.6		
	Luganda	English only	29	3.9	2.511	0.09
		Luganda only	25	2.9		
		Both	9	2.9		
Exposure to Luganda	English	Diploma	17	2.7	0.236	0.815
		Degree	11	2.9		
	Luganda	Diploma	17	2.7	0.754	0.458
		Degree	11	3.2		
Exposure to English	English	Diploma	3	4.7	10.804	0.000
		Degree	41	3.2		
		PGD	3	9.3		
	Luganda	Diploma	3	2.7	2.09	0.136
		Degree	41	3.3		
		PGD	3	5.3		
Experience	English	1-5 years	25	2.6	4.769	0.005
		6-10 years	25	4		
		16-20 years	8	6		
		> 20 years	5	3.6		
	Luganda	1-5 years	25	2.9	1.331	0.273
		6-10 years	25	3.8		
		16-20 years	8	3.8		
		> 20 years	5	2.8		

Regarding the the relationship between the influence of the language taught and the interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse, the study established that although teachers of English language only outperformed the other two categories in both English and Luganda, the the statistics show that language taught is not a major predictor of Interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse. This is because all the sig-values are above the level at which the researcher's assumption was tested (0.05). To this effect, one respondent of Luganda and French made the following remarks:

"Some words Rubindi, cattle bird's egg are difficult to interprete"

She added:

"Ebigambo ebimu nkikiitanye nabyo okufuna amakulu, ebisoko ebimu si byangu okufunira ebigambo mu luzungu-empummumpu, za mbidde nga zijjudde kisunje"

Translated;

"It was a tag of war for me to translate certain terms – some idiomatic expressions were quite hard to translate"

Another respondent observed that:

"Translating the poem required time and careful analytical thought about the whole poem and individual lines."

The above statements emphasize the fact that maintaining fidelity in translation from the source to target languages is very difficult owing to the different cultural identities and motivations underlying every language.

In relation to exposure to Luganda, results in Table 4.4 indicate that interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse is slightly skewed in favor of those whose level of exposure to Luganda is Bachelors degree with an average score of 2.9 on the

use of a corresponding metaphor to translate the text into English and 3.2 in Luganda.
On the other hand, teachers whose level of exposure to Luganda was Diploma on average scored 2.7 in both Luganda and English. But despite this revelation, the results fail to support the researcher's initial assumption that the level of Luganda exposure has a positive correlation vis a vis its impact with interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse. This is evidenced by the probability values (.815 and .458 that) are above 0.05. This means that regardless of the level of exposure to Luganda, use of a corresponding metaphor to translate the text into English is the same for all categories of teachers.

One responded observed:

> **"The text was not very easy because it had hidden meanings of some words which were not easy to translate"**

The above statement postulates the translation theory associated with the view that the translation of texts with hidden meaning is never a simple task.

Turning to English exposure, the study revealed that teachers with Post graduate diploma on average had higher scores (9.33) when it comes to the use a corresponding metaphor to translate the text into English. These were followed by teachers holding diploma whose average was 4.67 while those with bachelors' degree came last with an average of 3.3 and the observed differences in the performance were higly significant (0.000 < 0.05). Indeed, there were several cases where many degree teachers feared to sit for the tests where the diploma holders were so sure of themselves and many diploma holders performed better. Commenting on the test that aimed at determing the translatability of metaphors in English, one diploma teacher remarked:

"The text was easy to translate because it was concerning day to day life i.e. people in relationships (marriage situation)".

Another one added:

"It is easy when translating"

Still, another respondent commented:

"The text was easy to translate due to the direct use of words"

However, there was no significant influence realized between one's formal Luganda exposure and their cognizance of metaphors. This is evidenced by a high sig-value (0.136> 0.05).

In relation to teaching experience vis a vis the interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse, the findings in 4.4 revealed significant mean differences in relation to English and these differences were more evident among teachers whose teaching experience was 16-20 yrs with an average of 6.0. The results thus indicate that teaching experience has a significant effect on interlingual translatability of metaphors in English. In Luganda however, there is no significant relationship between the teaching experience and one's ability in interlingual translatability of metaphors in English. This insignificant effect was given by a sig-value .273 which is above 0.05. This implies that the observed differences in the means are not significant.

A respondent made the following remarks concerning the translation of the Luganda text to English:

"It has been difficult to translate because with some words, they are not in the English dictionary; however, I made direct translation. Such a description is not found among the English;

instead, they can use one word to mean a variety of words in Luganda"

Such remarks aver the fact that translation work is often very hard to make owing to the different cultural contexts where different languages are set.

Another respondent added:

"The text has been easy to translate though the exact words are difficult to find in Luganda, translating English to Luganda, its really hectic and stressing since you have to think a lot about the exact words that match with the English words. But I have enjoyed it"

A teacher whose teaching experience varied between 6-10 yrs intimated:

"It is not easy at all, I have failed"

With such remarks, it is quite clear that interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse is really a very hard task owing to the different linguistic images across languages.

A respondent whose teaching experience was between 1-5 yrs realized that:

"The text had some difficult English words that are not easily translated into Luganda e.g. rubindi, the text was interesting thus easily translated by a focused reader"

Despite such remarks, the respondent scored 2 marks out of 10. This made the researcher deduce that several respondents never wanted to be realistic with their remarks. Many respondents hardly scored 5 marks out of 10.

4.4 Data from test question three: metaphoric enhancement measures in discourse

Some empirical studies such as (Odlin, 1989), (Perdue, 1993) all in cited by (Swan, 2008), confirmed what language teachers have always known: that the L1 has a strong influence on the way a second language is used. This is usually the case owing to the fact that serious problems arise where the second language contains whole classes of words which are not shared by the L1. Teachers' perceptions of linguistic or cultural distance may also affect their readiness to use some metaphors. Accordingly, in the third research question, and specifically research objective three, the research aimed at finding out how bilingual's communicative competence enhances the interlingual use of metaphors. This question was analyzed using the questions from the test in Section C. Table 4.5 gives a summary of the average scores on metaphoric enhancement measures in discourse in relation to a teacher's L1.

Table 4.5: Effect of L1 one the use of metaphors in discourse

	L1	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	F	Sig.
Enhancement measures of metaphors in discourse (English)	English	7	7.3	0.6	.370	.692
	Luganda	63	7.1	3.8		
	Total	70	7.2	3.6		
Enhancement measures of metaphors in discourse (Luganda)	English	7	9.3	0.6	.442	.645
	Luganda	63	8.0	3.6		
	Total	70	8.1	3.4		

In relation to enhancement measures of metaphors in discourse (English), respondents whose mother tongue was English performed better with an average of 7.33 compared to those whose L1 was Luganda with an average of 7.1. The same differences were noted in Luganda where teachers whose L1 was English had an average of 9.33 as opposed to teachers whose first language was Luganda with an average of 8.0. But since the observed differences in the average scores were insignificant in the two cases, the conclusion was that L1 is a non significant factor in metaphoric enhancement measures in discourse. This assertion is made on the basis of the findings in which it was established that mother tongue has no statistically significant role it plays in explaining the variations in respondents average scores in metaphors in discourse as shown by the the sig-values (.692 and .645) which were all above 0.05 the level at which we would have accepted the assumption that first language leadts to metaphoric enhancement measures in discourse

An attempt was also made to determine the effect of other background information of the participants on their average scores on the use of metaphors in discourse. The findings are given in Table 4.6

Table 4.6: Teachers performance on the use of metaphors in discourse based on other bio-data of the teachers

Variable	Use of metaphors in:	Attribute	N	Mean	F	p-value
Taught language	English	English only	31	8.9	7.987	0.001
		Luganda only	25	5.9		
		Both	10	5.2		
	Luganda	English only	31	9.2	3.018	0.056
		Luganda only	25	7.2		
		Both	10	7.2		
Exposure to Luganda	English	Diploma	10	7.2	1.245	0.224
		Degree	66	8.1		

	Luganda	Diploma	15	6.9	-0.69	0.496
		Degree	14	7.9		
Exposure to English	English	Diploma	3	7.3	0.861	0.43
		Degree	41	7.7		
		PGD	3	10.3		
	Luganda	Diploma	3	9.3	0.665	0.519
		Degree	41	8.1		
		PGD	3	10.3		
Experience	English	1-5 years	27	6	2.786	0.048
		6-10 years	24	7.3		
		16-20 years	9	9		
		> 20 years	6	9.7		
	Luganda	1-5 years	27	7.3	1.988	0.125
		6-10 years	24	8		
		16-20 years	9	10.4		
		> 20 years	6	8.7		

In Table 4.6, the average scores indicate that teaching English only enhances the use of metaphors in discourse in both English (mean = 8.9) and Luganda (mean = 9.2). This is because compared to other teachers; those whose teaching subject was only English had the highest average scores in the two subjects. However, a look at the corresponding probability values indicates that its only Enhancement measures of metaphors in English which is significant (0.001 < 0.05). Therefore, one tentative conclusion that can be drawn from the table is that language taught leads to enhancement measures of metaphors in English but not Luganda because in the latter case, the sig value of 0.0565 was above 0.05 level of significance. The findings thus suggest that being a Luganda teacher does not necessarily mean having high degree of cultural knowledge.

When it comes to the use of metaphors in English in relation to exposure to Luganda, teachers whose level of Luganda exposure was a Degree level performed better with an average score of 8.1 while Diploma holders had an average of 7.2. Similarly, in

relation to level of exposure Luganda, Degree holders still dominated diploma teachers in using metaphors in Luganda as indicated by the two averages where the former had a mean of 7.9 while the latter had 6.9. But since the corresponding p-values (that is, .224 and .496) were all greater than 0.05, the findings indicate that the Level of Luganda exposure is not an important or meaningful factor in accounting for differences in the use of metaphors in English.

On the level of exposure to Luganda, it was established that although teachers whose formal exposure to English was Post Graduate Diploma performed better in both English (mean = 10.3) and Luganda (mean = 10.3) compared to those with lower qualifications, the differences in the means were so negligible to support the postulation that level of formal exposure to English has an effect on the use of metaphors in discourse. Thus, whether formal exposure to English is Diploma, Degree or Post graduate level, use of metaphors in discourse tends to be uniform.In the same Table, the findings indicated that teaching experience significantly ($p = 0.048 < 0.05$) enhance the use of metaphors in English. From the computed mean values, we see that as the teaching experience increases from year one and above, the scores on the use of metaphors in English also rise. This means that, teaching experience is an important predictor of enhancement measures of metaphors in discourse (English). In Luganda however, despite one's teaching experience, metaphorical cognizance in discourse can always remain a grey area in teachers' comprehension. The sig-value of .125 is above 0.05. This implies that one's teaching experience does not significantly increase the use of metaphors in Luganda.

<center>**CHAPTER FIVE**</center>

<center>**SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**</center>

5.0   Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the findings of the study in respect to the research questions.

5.1   Summary of findings

5.1.1   Research Question One: What does understanding a metaphor entail?

In the first research question, the findings indicated the performance of respondents in line with what it entails to understand metaphors in discourse. According to the findings, participants in this research exhibited a significant degree of knowledge of metaphors since the mean scores were above average in the two tests as indicated in Table 4.1 in the previous chapter. The good performance of respondents in their mother tongue is attributed to the higher degree of cultural knowledge they enjoy in that language. However, as a specific answer to research question one whether or not the teachers' L1 was related to understanding figurative expressions, the study found a significant effect of the L1 on interlingual cognizance of metaphors used in English and Luganda. Specifically, the t-test results in Table 4.1 showed that English as a mother tongue increases teachers' cognizance of metaphors in both languages. This assertion is made in view of the fact that in both languages, teachers whose L1 was English on average scored higher marks than their Luganda counterparts in the test questions that aimed at determining their level of understanding of metaphors used in English and Luganda. The differences in the average scores were statistically significant at 0.05. From this finding it can be claimed that for those teacher whose first language is English, acquisition of a second language leads to a next ended

<center>98</center>

repertoire in the L1. In other words, while the speaker was still able to use L1 rules, he was also able to import L2 rules, structures and meanings into the first language. So, English as L1 may have made some participants in this study more likely to find meaning in the expressions in the two languages compared to their counterparts whose first language was Luganda. Going by this revelation, English as a first language can be a factor to help teachers' improve their pedagogical practices in the teaching and learning process.

5.1.2 Research Question Two: How does familiarity with the use of metaphors in one language guarantee equal familiarity with their use in another language?

The specific aim of the second research question was to investigate whether the mother tongue enhances interlingual translatability of metaphors in both English and Luganda languages. In the results of Section B of the two tests which were marked out of 10, majority of the respondents scored low marks and did not pass this section. The average for translation of metaphors in English was 3.7 while that of Luganda was 3.4 (Table 4.3) all of which were below average. Most of the teachers met several difficulties translating metaphorical items of marked language forms from one language to the other. They indulged in literal translations and this could hardly bring out the original meanings of the source text. A few respondents could maintain the fidelity in translation. Meaning was greatly distorted and tampered with-killing the original ideas of the source text. Several respondents were devoid of skills in Luganda orthography so much so that even the remarks about the difficulties they encountered while translating the texts were made in English.

Although the findings in Table 4.3 were statistically insignificant ($p > 0.05$), the results obtained from the statistical analysis of the second research question showed

that the mother tongue improves teachers' linguistic accuracy with particular reference to translation of metaphors in discourse. According to the t-test results, there were differences in the average scores obtained between the two parties: each party translated better the metaphors that originated in or caused by their mother tongues and the amount of variation was quite substantial within both groups.

5.1.3 Research Question Three: How can bilingual's communicative competence be enhanced in the interlingual cognizance of metaphors?

In the third and final research question, the purpose was to explain the enhancement measures for a bilingual in the interlingual cognizance of metaphors in discourse. In relation to enhancement measures of metaphors in discourse (English), respondents whose L1 was English performed better with an average of 7.33 compared to those whose L1 was Luganda with an average of 7.1 (Table 4.5). The same differences were noted in Luganda where teachers whose L1 was English had an average of 9.33 as opposed to teachers whose first language was Luganda with an average of 8.0. But since the observed differences in the average scores were insignificant in the two cases, the conclusion was that mother tongue is a non-significant factor in metaphoric enhancement measures in discourse. In the test which was marked out of 20, majority of the teachers displayed inability to detect the pragmatic conventions associated with intercultural communication. They were not guided to which text contained metaphors in order for the researcher not to invalidate the experiment.

5.2 Conclusions

The logical conclusion basing on the findings of the study is such that:

- Based on the study finding, English as a mother tongue to a high degree influences teachers' cognizance of metaphors in discourse used in English and Luganda.

- L1 has no statisticaly significant influence in explaining teachers' translatability of metaphors. However, a key point to note is that there were differences in the average scores obtained between the two parties: each party translated better the metaphors that originated in or caused by their mother tongues and the amount of variation was quite substantial within both groups

- Lastly, in relation to enhancement measures of metaphors in discourse, the study failed to find any significant effect of L1 on teachers' use of metaphors. In the test which was marked out of 20, majority of the teachers in the two categories (L1 & L2) displayed inability to detect the pragmatic conventions associated with intercultural communication. Since metaphorical communication presupposes a deeper understanding of a particular culture's imagistic details, socio-cultural conventions and pragmalinguistics, several teachers were non committal to sit the research tests and those who cooperated expressed extreme nervousness.

5.3 Recommendations

Owing to the evidence accumulated from the research findings, discussion of results and drawn conclusions, the following recommendations were made:

1. The first recommendation is that more research is needed into regional variation in metaphoric language, and the results need to be fed back into key commercial reference materials.

2. Material developers can also make use of the findings of this study and design sections of metaphors in which the teachers have to translate sentences from

L1 to L2 with the newly learned structures in English. Accordingly, the study recommends that material developers include exercises and activities in their materials which require the learners to translate texts from the first language to the second using accurate grammatical sentences.

3. Attempts should also be made that the English and Luganda taught in schools are more relevant to the learners' intercultural communicative challenges.

4. The interlingual use of metaphors in discourse is an indisputable paradigm amongst bilinguals in any speech community; rendering it to be a very intriguing linguistic area of study. Linguists therefore, should come up with documentations like textbooks that address both culture and the metaphor because the two phenomena are communicatively in tandem.

5. Since school has been correctly identified as the melting pot for formal language learning and exposure, language teachers should therefore; dedicate time to teach intralingual stylistics, intercultural linguistics with a bias to cultural imagistic details that underpin the use of metaphorical expressions in discourse because evidence has shown that metaphors can be learnt once taught. It is not a question of magic for one to grasp and use a metaphor in communication.

6. Understanding is a complex issue; scoring 100% does not guarantee one has understood. Therefore, let the language be studied more, used more in everyday lives of people, then language will take on colour.

5.4   Areas for further research

1. First, this study was mainly concerned with the effect of the mother tongue on interlingual and intralingual metaphoric competence in understanding,

translating and use of metaphors in discourse; nevertheless, there is still space for the future researches on other aspects of the second language proficiency, such as listening, writing or speaking, and their relationship with other aspects of metaphoric competence, like productive metaphoric competence.

2. Secondly, the future study should involve as many teachers as possible to promote the accuracy of the results.

3. Besides, more test items are supposed to be added in future tests in order to make the aspects of metaphoric competence be tested thoroughly and fairly as well as improve the validity of the test instrument

4. Scholars especially in the fields of Pragmatics, Translation and Stylistics should take up comparative studies to establish how interlingual cognizance of metaphors and translatabilty can be taught in both English and Luganda mindful of the fact that these two languages have different cultural identities hence have varying socio-cultural components.

5. Research should be taken to find out whether interlingual and intralingual stylistics are taught in higher institutions of learning.

6. Research should be carried out by linguists to come up with the intercultural metaphorical motivations between English and Luganda languages especially leaning on the world views of both cultures.

REFERENCES

Achebe, C. (1958). *Things Fall Apart*. Dar es Salaam: East African Educational Publishers.

Adorno, T. (1993). *The culture industry: Selected essay on mass culture*. Routledge.

Aintzane, D. (2013). *Metaphoric competence and the acquisition of figurative vocabulary in foreign language learning*. http://institucional.us.es/revistas/elia/13/art_2.pdf

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *Journal 56 (1)*, 57 – 64.

Amin, M. E. (2005). *Social science research; Conception, methodology and analysis*. Makerere University, Kampala.

Archer, T. (1931). *The Proverb*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Attali, J. (1991). *Millenium: Winners and Losers in the coming world order* (Leila Conners & Nathan Gardels, Trans.). New York: Random House.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words oxford*. Clarendon Press.

Bada, E. (2000). Culture in ELT. *Cukurova University Journal of Social Sciences (6)*, 100 – 110.

Barber, B. R. (1995). *Jihads vs. McWorld: How the Planet is both falling apart and coming together-and what this means for democracy*. New York: Times Books.

Barcelona, A. (2009). *Event Structure Metaphor* http://www.texte.com/theory/Metaphor?html [Accessed on 24 July 2010].

Bates, E., Devescovi, A., & Wulfeck, B. (2001). Psycholinguistics: A cross-language perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 369-396.

Bernardi, U. (1998). *Globalizacja kultury: przeciw nowym I starym przesadam*. 'Spoeczenstwo", "Civitas Christiana, No.2.

Bialystok, E. (1988). *Levels of bilingualism and levels of linguistic awareness*. Developmental Psychology, 24, 560-567.

Bloom, A. H. (1981). *The linguistic shaping of thought: A study in the impact of language on thinking in China and the West*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Boers, F. (2003). Applied Linguistics: Perspectives on Cross-cultural Variation in Conceptual Metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol, 18(4)*: 231-238

Bransford, J. D., Barclay, J. R., & Franks, J. J. (1972). Sentence memory: A constructive versus interpretive approach. *Cognitive psychology, 3*, 193-209.

Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural studies in foreing language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Byram, M. (1997a). "Cultural awareness in vocabulary learning." *Language Learning Journal, 16*, 51-57.

Byram, M. (1997b). "Cultural studies and foreign language teaching." In Bassnett, S. (ed). *Studying British cultures: An introduction*. London: Routledge, 53-65.

Byram, M. (ed) (1994a). *Culture and language learning in higher education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Bullough, R.V., Jr., & Gitlin, A. (1995). *Becoming a student of teaching: Methodologies for exploring self and school context*. New York: Garland.

Cacciari, C. & Glucksberg, S. (1994). *Understanding figurative language*. In M.A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), Handbook of psycholinguistics (pp447-477). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Caroll, D. W. (2008). *Psychology of language* (5th ed.). USA: University of Wisconsin.

Cazden, C. B. (1967). *The situation of social class in language*. Use Phi Delta, Kappan.

Cecilie, L. A. (2014). *An investigation of metaphor comprehension in the EFL classroom based on the textbook Targets for Vg1 students in the general education program*. Unpublished master thesis. https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/39217/Aardal-master.pdf?sequence=1.

Chandler, D. (1994). *The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis*. Online documents at URL. http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/short/whorf.html. [30.06.2004].

Charteris-Black, J. (2002). Second language figurative proficiency: A comparative study of Malay and English. *Applied Linguistics, 23(1)*, 104–133.

Chastain, K. (1971). *The development of modern language skills: Theory to practice*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1968). *Language and mind*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Clark, H. H, & Lucy, P. (1975). Understanding What is Meant from What is Said: A Study in Conversationally conveyed requests. *A Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviours, 14*, 56-72.

Cooke, M. A. (1970). Suggestions for developing more positive attitude toward native speakers of Spanish. In H.N. Seelye. (Ed). *Perspectives for teachers of Latin American culture*. Springfield, IL: State Department of Public Instruction.

Cook, V. J. (2001). *Using the first language in the classroom*. Canadian Modern Language Review.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analyses and interlangauge*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cross, T., Bazron, B., Dennis, K., & Isaacs, M. (1989). *Towards A Culturally Competent System of Care, Volume I.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Child Development Center, CASSP Technical Assistance Center.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *The language that took over the world*. The Guardian.

Csábi, S. (2004). A cognitive linguistic view of polysemy in English and its implications for teaching. In M. Achard & S. Niemeier (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 233–256). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

David, E. *Therapeutic Metaphors and Clinical Hypnosis*. http://Hypnos.co.uk/hmnomy/esparza.html Accessed on September 29, 2009.

Danesi, M. (2008). Conceptual errors in second-language learning. In S. DeKnop & T. De Rycker (Eds.), *Cognitive approaches to pedagogical grammar: A volume in honour of René Dirven* (pp. 231-256). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Danesi, M. (1992). Metaphor and classroom second language learning. *Romance Languages Annual, 3*, 189-194.

Davidson, D. (1980). *What metaphors mean.* In Platts, M. (ed.) Reference, Truth and Reality. London: Routeledge & Kegan Paul, pp238-54.

Davidson, D. (1999). *The philosophy of Donald Davidson*. (ED) Lewis Edwin Hahn. Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company.

Deignan, A., Gabrys, D. & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English Metaphors Using Cross-linguistic Awareness-raising Activities. *ELT Journal 51(4)*: 352:360.

Dilthey, W. (1989). *Introduction to the human sciences: An attempt to lay a foundation for the study of society and history*. Wayne State University Press.

Dunkling, L. (1995). *A dictionary of epithets and terms of address*. Cambridge University Press, London.

Fletcher, C. R. (1994). Levels of representation in memory for discourse. In M.A. Gernsbacher (Ed.). *Handbook of psycholinguistics* (pp.589-607).San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Golden, A. (2005). *Grasping the point: A study of 15- year- old students' comprehension of metaphorical expressions in schoolbooks*.

Foucault, M. (1994). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. USA: Vintage Books.

Fromkin, V. and Rodman, R. (1988). *An Introduction to language*. Cambridge Press, London.

Gardener, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational vaiables in second langauge acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13*, 191-272.

Gardener, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second langauge learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Gardener, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1972). Langauge, aptitude, intelligence, and second langauge achievement. *Journal of Psychology, 56*, 191-199.

Gibbs, R. W., and Gerrig, R. (1989). *How context makes metaphor comprehension seem special*. Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 3,145-158.

Gibbs, R.W. (1992b). What do idioms really mean? *Journal of Memory and Language, 31*, 485-506.

Glucksberg, S. and Keysar, B. (1990). Understanding metaphorical comparisons: Beyond Similarity. *Psychological Review, 97*, 3-18.

Glucksberg, S., Keysar, B., & McGlone, M. S. (1992). Metaphor understanding and accessing conceptual schema: Reply to Gibbs (1992) *Psychological Review, 99*, 578-581.

Glucksberg, S., Manifredi, D.A., & McGlone, M.S. (1997). Metaphor Comprehension: How metaphors create new categories. In T.B. Ward, S.M. Smith, & J.Vaid (Eds.), *Creative thought: An investigation of conceptual structures and processes* (pp.327-350). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Glucksberg, S. (1998). *Understanding metaphors. Current Directions in Psychological Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grady, J. (1999). *A Typology of Motivation for Conceptual Metaphor: Correlation vs Resemblance*. Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Graesser, A. C., Mio, J., & Millis, K. K. (1989). Metaphors in persuasive. In D. Meutsch & R. Viehoff (Eds.), *Comprehension of literary discourse: Results and problems of interdisciplinary approaches* (pp.131-154). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Grice, H. P. (1981). *Presuppositions and conversational implicature*. In Cole (1981:183-98).

Gumperz, J. J. (1972). "*The speech community*". In Giglioli, PP. (1972). <u>Language</u> and Social Context. Penguin Books, London.

Harold, R. A. (1964). *Readings in applied linguistics*. (2nd ED.). New York. Meredith Corporation.

Haugen, E. (1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Publications of the American Dialect Society 26, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Herdina, P. and Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in pyscholinguistics*.

Hoang, H. (2014). *Metaphor and Second Language Learning: The State of the Field*. August 2014 – Volume 18, Number 2.

Hoffman, R., & Kemper, S. (1987). *What could reaction time studies be telling us about metaphor comprehension*? Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 2, 149-189

Honeck, R. P. and Temple, J. G. (1994). *Proverbs*. The Extended Conceptual Base and Great Chain Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 9, 85-112.

Honeck, R. P. (1977). *A proverb in mind: The cognitive science of proverbial wit and wisdom*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Honeck, R.P. (1997). *A proverb in Mind: The Cognitive Science of Proverbial Wit and Wisdom*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Humboldt, K. W. (1876). *The heterogeneity of language and its influence on the intellectual development of mankind*.

Hymes, D. (1972). Introduction. In Courtney, B. Cazden, Vera, P. john and Dell Hymes (Eds.). *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jabak, O. (2005). *Why is translation into the mother tongue more successful than into a second language?*

http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article1508.php

Johnson, M. (1995). *Moral imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the Mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and Reason*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Kamugisha, M. J. M. (2001). "*A short typology of Ugandan greeters, with special reference to academia*. New Vision Publishing Press. (21st September, 2001).

Katz, J. J. and Fodor, J. A. (1964). *The structure of a semantic theory*. In Fodor & Katz (1964:479-518).

Kawere, E. K. N. (2000). *Zinunula Omunaku* (6th ed.). Kampala: Uganda Literature Bureau.

Kimball, J. (1973). *Seven principles of surface structure parsing in natural language*. Cognition, 2, 15-47.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2005). English across cultures: identity and communication. In Honna (Ed.), *English as an international language* (pp. 161-182). Tokoyo JN: Aoyama Gakuin University.

Kitao, K. (2000). *Teaching culture in foreign language instruction in the United States*. Online documents at URL

http:www.ilc2.doshisha.ac.jp/users/kkitao/library/article/culture.htm. [14.06.2004]. 83.

Kiwanuka, E. S. (1986). *Letter writing*. Kampala: Marianum Press.

Kochman, J. K. (1987). *Teaching foreign languages*. Longman, U.K.

Kothiari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd Ed.). Wishwa Prakashan.

Kovecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kramsch, C. (1988). The cultural discourse of foreign language textbooks. In A. Singerman (Ed.), *Towards a new intergration of language and culture* (pp.63-68). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2001). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C., Cain, A., & Murphy-Lejeune, E. (1996). Why should language teachers teach culture? *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 9 (1)*, 99-107.

Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). *Determining sample size for research activities, Educational and psychological measurement*, 30, 608, Sage Publications.

Labov, W. (1972). *Social stratification of English in New York City*. New York: Academic Press.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistic across cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lakoff and Kovecses, Z. (1987). The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English. In Holland, D. and Quinn, N. (eds). *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge University Press, 195-221.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh*. New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1986). *A figure of Thought*. Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, (1) 215-225.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1995). *Moral politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (2nd ed., 2001).

Le Page, R. A. (1964). *The national language question: Linguistic problems of newly independent states*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leech, G. (1996). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman, London.

Levin, S. (1976). *Concerning what kind of a poem a speech act is*. In Van Dijk (1976:141-60).

Levin, S. (1977). *The Semantics of metaphor*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Levinson. S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press, London.

Littlemore, J. and Low, G. (2006). 'Metaphoric competence, second language learning and communicative language ability'. *Applied Linguistics, vol 27*, no. 2, pp. 268-294. DOI: 10.1093/applin/aml004.

Low, G. (1988). On Teaching Metaphor. *Applied Linguistics, 9 (2)*: 215-225.

Lustig, M. W., and Koester, J. (2003). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*.V.I: University Press, Cambridge.

Masagazi, K. and Kyagaba (1992). *BALYA N'ENSEKEEZI*. Kampala: Nets Africana Limited.

Masumi, A (2007). *Positive and Negative Effects of Mother-tongue Knowledge on the Interpretation of Figurative Expressions*. http://repository.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2433/141347/1/pls15_7Azuma.pdf.

McDevitt, B. (2004). Negotiating the syllabus: A win-win syllabus. *ELT Journal, 58 (1)*, 3-9.

McKay, S. L. (2003). *The cultural basis of teaching English as an international language*. Online documents at URL http://www.tesol.org/pubs/articles/2003/tm13-4-10.htm. [30.06.2004].

McNamara, J. (1987). "A Linguistic Performance". A Psychological Overview. *Journal of Social issues, Vol.23*, PP. 58-77.

Meredith et al. (2003). *Education research: An Introduction* (7th ed.). Pearson Education, USA.

Merwin, W. S. (1960). *The Drunk in the Furnace*. New York City: University Press.

Muriel, S. T. (1987). *Linguistics and anthropology*. D.C Georgetown, Washington: University Press.

Noonan, J. (1996). *The Church Visible*. New York: Viking.

Nordquist, R. (2009). *Metaphors be with you*, http:grammarabout.com [Accessed on 2nd July, 2009].

Ortony, A. (ed.) (1979). *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortony, A. Schallert, D. L., Reynolds, R. E., & Amos, S.J. (1978). Interpreting Metaphors and Idioms. *Some effects of Context on Comprehension Journal of Verbal Behaviour, 17*, 465-477.

Osgood, C. E. (1957). A Behaviorist Analysis of Perception and Language as a cognitive phenomena. In: Brunner,J.S., et al., Eds., Contemporary Approach to Cognition,Harvard University Press,Cambridge,p.56

Pollio, H., Barlow, J., Fine, H. & Pollio, M. (1977). *Psychology the poetics of growth: Figurative language in psychology, psychotherapy and education*. Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum.

Pulverness, A. (2003). *Distinctions and dichotomies: Culture-free, Culture-bound.* Online documents at URL http://www.britcoun.org.pl/forum/distanddich.htm. [17.06.2004].

Pulverness, A. (2004). *Here and there: Issues in materials development for intercultural learning.* Online documents at URL http://elt.britcoun.org.pl/forum/handt.htm. [25.06.2004].

Qian, Z., Liang, Y. & Yanqing, Y. (2014). Correlation between Receptive Metaphoric Competence and Reading Proficiency. *English Language Teaching; Vol. 7,* No. 11; 2014. http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFile/41517/22750 .

Quine, W. V. (1980). *From a logical point of view: Nine Logical-philosophical essays*. Havard University Press.

Reddy, M. (1979). The conduit metaphor. In A. Ortony(Ed.), Metaphor and thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman.

Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago: University Press.

Samovar, L.A. and Porter, R. E. (1991). *Communication between cultures*. California: Wadsworth.

Sapir, E. (1921). *Langauge: An introduction to the study of speech*. Online documents at URL http://www.bartleby.com/186/10.htm1#txt17.

Sapir, E. (1962). *Culture, language and personality*. University of California.

Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect Speech Acts. In P. Cole & J. L Morgan (eds.) *Syntax ans Semantics*, Vol 3. Speech Acts (pp 59-82). New York Seminar.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge University Press.

Shahin, V. and Mehdi, M. (2010). *The effect of using translation from l1 to l2 as a teaching technique on the improvement of EFL learners' linguistic accuracy - focus on form.*

Shore, B. (1996). *Culture in Mind*.

Smith, P. (2001). *Cultural Theory: An Introduction*. Malden Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Soames, S. (1979). *A projection problem for speaker presuppositions*. Linguistic inquiry, 10.4, 623-66.

Ssematimba, H. E. B. (2003). *Abooluganda Ab'enda Emu*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.

Stalnaker, R. (1999). *Context and Content*, Oxford: Oxford University press.

Stanley, W. S. (1993). *The second four books of poems*. Port Townsend Washington: Copper Canyon Press.

Stern, H. H. (1990). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: University Press.

Strawson, P. F. (1964). *Intention and convention in speech acts*. Philosophical Review, 73,439-60 (Reprinted in Searle (1971:23-38).

Su, L. (2000). *Mapping in Thought and Language as Evidenced in Chinese Studies*, 18:395-424.

Swan, M. (2008). *The influence of the mother tongue on second language vocabulary acquisition and use*. http://www.mikeswan.co.uk/elt-applied-linguistics/influence-second-language.htm

Teymouri, A. M. and Hamidreza, D. (2014). *Metaphoric Competence and Language Proficiency in the Same Boat*, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 98, 6 May 2014, Pages 1895-1904, ISSN 1877-0428, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.620.

The Longman Dictionary of Poetic Terms (1989) Vol 2,1st Ed.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica (1985). Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Trudgill, P. (1974). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction*. Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin Books.

Turner, M. (1991). *Reading Minds: The study of English in the Age of Cognitive Science*. Princeton University Press.

Tylor, E. B. (1873). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology*. Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1873. Print.

Ungerer, F. and Schmid, H. (1996). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) (1976). *Pragmatics of Language and literature*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Wangusa, T. (1994). *A Pattern of Dust*. Kampala Fountain Publishers, Kampala, Uganda.

Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolfgang, B. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal*, Winter 2003, No 28, 29-39.

Wolcolto, J. (1967). *Second language teaching for specific purposes*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL* (pp. 14-33). Newbury House Publishers.

Yan, X. (2015). *Implication of Metaphor in Language Teaching*. International Conference on Arts, Design and Contemporary Education (ICADCE 2015)

Zheng, H. and Song, W. (2010). *Metaphor analysis in the educational discourse.* A critical review September 2010, Volume 8, No.9 (Serial No. 84) US-China Foreign Language, ISSN 1539-8080, USA.

Appendix A: Test one

GRADUATE LANGUAGE TEACHERS' TEST IN LOWER SECONDARY LEVEL ON THE INTERLINGUAL COGNISANCE OF METAPHORS: A CASE STUDY OF THE SELECTED EXPERIENTIAL DOMAINS OF ENGLISH AND LUGANDA.

1:30 MINUTES

Attempt all questions.

Dear respondent,

You have been selected as indicated in the above study which is being carried out as part of academic research in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the degree of Master of Arts (LINGUISTICS) of Makerere University Kampala.

Your co-operation in responding to this instrument will go a long way in ensuring success of this study.

Responses will only be used for academic purposes and will be accorded utmost confidentiality. There is no need of indicating your name on the test paper.

Respondents' bio-data (Tick the right option).

1. First Language.   English ☐ Luganda ☐ Others (specify)…………………

2. Level of formal linguistic exposure

    a) English/Literature in English   Degree ☐   Postgraudate ☐

       Diploma ☐   Masters ☐   PhD ☐

    b) Luganda

       Diploma ☐   Degree ☐   Postgraduate ☐   Masters ☐

       PhD ☐

3. Taught languages

English only ☐   Luganda only ☐   Both ☐   Others (specify)……….

4. Teaching experience

1-5 yrs ☐   6-10 yrs ☐   11-15 yrs ☐   16-20 yrs ☐

Others (specify)…………………….

Section A.

Given the following sets of sentences indicated in section A:

(a) There are ten pairs of sentences given in each sub-section.Read both sentences carefully and then, by use of a tick, identify the sentence with a metaphorical expression.

(b) All the sentences marked with that metaphorical expression share one key common idea. Write down that key common idea……………………………

(I)

1. We have been together for a long time. Look how far we have come.

2. There have been several difficulties in our relationship. It has been a long bumpy road.

3. We cannot turn back now. It is impossible for us to break up.

4. Our relationship is at a very critical stage. We are at cross roads.

5. We may have to go our separate ways. We no longer can be together.

6. There is no progress in our relationship. The relationship is not going anywhere.

7. We are enjoying our relationship. We are spinning our wheels.

8. Our relationship is off truck. Our relationship is not moving as we expected.

9. The marriage is in danger of falling. The marriage is on the rocks.

10. Something must be done to save our relationship. We are spinning our wheels.

(b) …………………………………………………….   (10 Marks).

(II)

1. She is a joy to behold. Her beauty is a golden sun setting over rolling hills.

2. I was bowled by his charm and good looks. I could not resist the temptation of falling in love with her.

3. She is awesomely beautiful. Her beauty is the rising sun over a crystal area.

4. That girl's beauty is unbelievable. That girl is an absolute knockout.

5. He is drop-dead gorgeous. He has marvelous looks.

6. When one looks at beauty, they feel soothsaid. Beauty is a child tenderly kissing her grandmother's wrinkled face.

7. Their new singer is currently the most popular. Their new singer is really hot.

8. His wife is full of life. His wife is a spring flower blossoming after the rain.

9. His voice is the sound of milk running over silk. He has a sweet voice.

10. Beauty is a treasure rare to find. Beauty is a lawn full of dandelions.

(b) …………………………………………………………..(10 mark)

(III)

1. He is being promoted. He is climbing the ladder.

2. He is a murderous leader. He is a blood thirsty despot.

3. She is moving up in the ranks quickly. She is getting quick promotions.

4. France rules the air. France has the strongest air force.

5. She is a tough and uncompromising leader. She is an iron-fisted demagogue.

6. Britain has the most formidable navy. Britain is the king of the waves.

7. The lion rules the jungle. The lion is the fiercest animal in the jungle.

8. He persisted to the top. He clawed his way to the top.

9. Blood and iron will solve the great question of the day. Issues will only be solved by fighting.

10. No one paid to his crying. His sweat and tears were not given moments of regard.

(b) Discover the metaphorical key idea and the image involved in the above pairs of sentences. …………………………………………………

(10 marks)

SECTION B

(a). Using a corresponding metaphor in Luganda , choose only ONE text of the three and translate it into Luganda.

(b)Comment on how difficult or easy the text was to translate.

(A)

I love you, my gentle one;

I love you, my gentle one;

My love is the fresh milk in the rubindi

Which you drank on the wedding day.

My love is the butter we were smeared with

To seal the fidelity into our hearts

You are the cattle bird's egg

For those who saw you are wealthy;

You are the papyrus reed of the lake,

Which they pull out with both hands

And I sing for you with tears

Because you possess my heart:

122

I love you my gentle one.

<center>(Ralph Bitamazire)</center>

Difficulty or ease associated with the translation of the text………………………

(B)

A mortal master piece

She sits before me, an infallible piece

A master work of bone, sinew, and skin

Defying perfection her fairest cheeks and feminine chin

Her form crafted and carved as a statue of ancient Greece

Lo! I would keep her hidden, a secret hidden unto me

Locked away to appease my most jealous heart

For it would cause out if e'er we were apart

My soul she holds captive, her eyes contained the very key

But I could not withhold such beauty from the Earth

A prisoner to my selfishness, a fate yet undeserved

Her expert shape and classic features to all should be observed

Not all the gold of the nations could match her shine or worth

So go my ornate masterpiece!

Go and share your radiant gleam

Go my venus de milo, my winged victory

And light the world with your achromic beam.

Difficulty or ease associated with the translation of the text………………………..

(C)

My friend, The Things that Do Attain

My Friend, The Things that Do Attain

The happy life be this governance, I find:

The riches left not got with pain;

The fruitful ground; the quiet mind;

The equal friend; no grudge; no strife;

No charge of rule, nor;

Without disease, the healthy life;

The household of continuance;

The mean diet, no dainty fare;

Wisdom joined with simpleness;

The might discharged of all care

Where wine the wit may not oppress

The faithful wife, without debate;

Such sleeps as may beguile the

Content thyself with thine estate,

Neither wish death, nor fear his might.   (10 marks)

Difficulty or ease associated with the translation of the text………………………….

SECTION C

(a)   Below is a pair of texts - A and B; read both texts and answer the questions

that follow:

(A)

Mary is a violet in autumn.

She bloomed too late,

purpling in the declining day.

even now she opens brightly

as the red-leaved air

sharpens with frost

The frost is hard-edged and quick.

it hones itself on the sides

of bare stones, the slim fingers

of poplar and dry husks

of harvested wheat.

Mary brightens and rises,

even as the frost

scythes its way

through rough earth.

(B)

At the christening of a long wished for princess, fairies invited as god mother offered

gifts, such as beauty, wit and musical talent. However a wicked fairy that had been

overlooked placed the princess under an enchantment as her gift saying that, on

reaching adulthood she would prick her finger on a spindle and die. A good fairy though unable to completely reverse the spell, said that the princess would instead sleep for a hundred yrs until awakened by the kiss of a prince and true love's first kiss.

The king forbade spinning on distaff or spindle or the possession of one, upon pain of death, throughout the kingdom, but all in vain. When the princess was fifteen or sixteen she chanced to come upon an old woman in a tower of the castle who was spinning. The princess asked to try the unfamiliar task and the inevitable happened. The wicked fairy's curse was the good fairy returned and put everyone in the castle to sleep. A forest of briars sprang up around the castle, shielding it from the outside world: no one could try to penetrate it without facing certain death in the thorns.

After a hundred yrs passed, a prince who had heard the story of the enchantment braved the wood which parted at his approach and entered the castle. He trembled upon seeing the princess' beauty and fell on his knees before her. He kissed her, then everyone in the castle woke to continue where they had left off and in modern versions, starting with the brother's Grimm version, they all lived happily ever after.

(b) Select and tick sentences which apply to either text A or B.

1. Without flesh and careful metaphor, your discourse is likely to lack the vitality and surprise that might make it memorable.

2. Metaphors render discourse less animated and boring therefore easily forgettable.

3. With a few words the metaphorical device communicates the emotions and associations from one context with objects and entities in a different context.

4. With the use of metaphorical items in discourse the mappings of experiences across domains in discourse becomes futile.

5. Metaphor suffuses our thoughts, no matter what we are thinking about.

6. Metaphor allows us to understand ourselves and our world in ways that no other modes of thought can.

7. Metaphor always fails to appeal to our deepest modes of everyday understanding.

8. Metaphor mitigates and compromises the effectiveness of style in discourse.

9. Metaphors lend ornamentation to discourse and deals with central and indispensable aspects of our conceptual systems.

10. Metaphors are obsolete language tools that are less admirable in powerful discourse.

11. Through the masterful use of metaphoric processes on which our conceptual systems are based, poets address the most vital issues in our lives and help us illuminate those issues through the extension, composition and criticism of the basic metaphoric tools through which we comprehend much of reality.

12. Users of metaphors cannot appeal to the ordinary metaphors we live by in order to take us beyond them to make us more insightful than we would be if we thought in standard ways. (10 marks)

GRADUATE LANGUAGE TEACHERS' TEST IN LOWER SECONDARY LEVEL ON THE INTERLINGUAL COGNISANCE OF METAPHORS: A CASE STUDY OF THE SELECTED EXPERIENTIAL DOMAINS OF ENGLISH AND LUGANDA.

1:30 MINUTES.

Wammanga owereddwa sentensi bbiri bbiri buli mulundi, (A – C) kakati kola bwooti:

(a) Teeka akayini nga olaga emboozi erimu ekimiimo eky'awamu.

(A)

1. Tulabye ebizibu mukwano. Tuyise mu biwonvu ne migga.

2. Tusisinkanye amayengo mangi. Tubonyeebonye nnyo naye tuwangudde.

3. Wabaddewo okubonabona n'okwesiima. Tuyise ku busozi ne ku miseetwe.

4. Tuli mu masangazira. Tutabuddwa eky'okukola.

5. Tuvuunuse emiyaga mingi. Tuyise mu bizibu bingi.

6. Tulabye ebizibu ebitagambika. Tuyise awaziyivu.

7. Tuyise mu kunyigirizibwa kungi. Tutambulidde ku maggwa mangi.

8. Tuvudde mu manyo ga mpisi. Tuyise mu mitawana mingi.

9. Tuyise mu manyo ga mpisi. Tuyise awatayitika.

10. Okwagalana kwaffe kutambulidde mu bisiriko. Tuyise mu mitawana mingi ddala.

(b) Era waliwo omulamwa   ogugoberedwa mu mboozi zonna awamu, laga

omulamwa ogwo………………………………………………….

(10 marks)

(B)

1. Mulungi nnyo. Mulungi lwondo.

2. Maaso mbira. Alina amaaso manene.

3. Maaso ndege. Amaaso malungi ddala.

4. Mugoggofu. Mukyala yakula bulungi.

5. Kijuujulu. Muwala alabika bulungi nnyo.

6. Obulungi tebubeerera. Obulungi nvannungi.

7. Maaso gaaka. Maaso ttala.

8. Mulungi tasangika. Mulungi kaalaala.

9. Abalungi bangi nnyo. Abalungi ndagalannamu.

10. Abalungi mbwa za nnamaaso. Abalungi tebaggwaayo.

(b) Era waliwo ekika k'yemiimo ekigoberedwa, laga ekika ky'emiimo

…………………………………………………………..

(10 marks)

(C)

1. Lusibira mubbwa. Afuga bubi nnyo.

2. Alabisa abantu ennaku. Afuga bumbula.

3. Y'akulembedde. Akutte enkasi.

4. Afugisa mukono gwa kyuuma. Alina efuggabbi.

5. Atudde ku Nnamulondo. Y'aali mu bukulembeze.

6. Mutemu nnyo. Mufuzi kijambiya.

7. Afuga kijambula. Wa ttima lingi.

8. Akooza kagiri. Alabisa obuyinike.

9. Abonyabonya. Azinya ngera.

10. Mufuzi kawenkene. Atutunza.

(b) Laga ekisigiddwa mu mboozi ezo wagulu.   (10 marks)

EKITUNDU B

(a) Owereddwa emboozi ssatu wammanga, londako emboozi emu ogivuunule okuva mu Luganda ogiteeke mu Lungereza nga bw' olaaga ebimiimo eby'awamu.

(A)

NSISINKANA BIRUNGI TEBIKKA MIREMBE.

Nenva kyenkana mu kirooto mwendi ne nzisa ekikkowe ekyansimatuka, ne namusa Mirembe. Yali wa kitema, mutono nga wa kataketake, omubiri gwe gwali mulebevu ate munyirivu nnyo, omutwe gwalina akakona, envIiri zaali za kaweke, nga za luwe. Amatu ge gaali mawanvuwanvumu nga galina embuga nnene, ekyenyi nga kya masega, akayindo ke kaali kalalo. Amaaso ge gaali manene ga ndege nga mu kiwanga tegatulaamu wabula okuligita obuligisi gati, obukowekoowe bwe bwali busonoofu ddala, ebisige bye nga bya musoke, obumwa butono ng'obwensumbi, nga bulimu amannyo ga kasenge nga mu lubu lw'engulu mwetondeseemu akazigo. Emba zaali mpanvumu era bweyamwenyanga oba okusekamu nga ku matama kujjako obunya. Ensingo ye yali mpanvu ate ng'esibaganye ebiseera.

Engalo ze zaali za mbidde nga zijudde kisunje. Ebigere byona nga bitukiridde. Amabere gaali biteko nga mpumumpu yena nga muterevu mu kikula kye. Amagulu ge gaalinamu ebitege bitono era ng'atambuza simbo nga yeesira mpola. Ate nga lwakuba mukkekeze era nga mutono bwatyo, naye ngalina ekitiibwa kimulabika era

130

ngalabikira ddala wa magezi ne munne meeya ng'amwasimula, n'ekisa kye nga kingi mu mwoyo.

(B)   OMUKAZI MATENDO

Abakazi b'ensi eno bimuli mikwano.

Abakazi ba Lugaba bimuli matendo.

Abakazi b'eggwanga bimuli ebirungi.

Ebimuli ebirungi tubinoga tubyezze.

Olususu olulungi lwa mukazi omulungi.

Obugonvu obulungi bwa mukazi omugonvu.

Akazigo akalungi ka mukazi omulungi.

Akawoowo akalungi ka mukazi omuyonjo.

Abakazi b'ensi eno bazaala emikwano.

Abakazi ba Lugaba baleeta emirembe.

Abakazi b'eggwanga bakola obugagga.

Bakola obugagga mbeegomba mukwano!

Abakazi be balima, balima ebirungi.

Omukazi bw'asomesa bulungi.

Abakazi ba bandi bakola amatendo.

Olusuku oluyonjo lwa mukazi amatendo.

Omukazi amatendo nga mukazi muteefu.

131

Omukazi omuteefu ng'olusuku olusalire,

Olusuku olusalire lwe lusuku olubikke.

Olusuku olubikke ye mukazi amatendo.

Omukazi n'ayogera n'ayogeza omukwano.

Omukazi n'atunula n'atunuza omukwano.

Omukazi n'amwenya ng'aseka mukwano.

Atambuleko bw'ati ng'atambuza mukwano.

Abakazi ba bandi bagwana ebirungi!

Abakazi ba Nnyinimu bassebo matendo.

Abakazi ba bandi bavudde amatendo.

Abatabalina bambi basubwa basubwa amatendo.

Abakazi we bataali tewaba matendo.

(Masagazi, Kitooke ne Kyagaba:06)

(C)   ENSI N'EMALA EKYUKA

Olwagwawo ne mmala ndoota!

Ndiga, Ngo bizannya wamu

Wambwa, Kkapa ne beekuba akawuna

Abafuzi ne bakwanagana

N'abafuge okukkanya

Amawanga ne gateeseganya

Bush, Saddamu nga batudde wamu

Kabira ayaniriza Mobutu

Amerika, Libiya guzisaza mu kabu

132

Entalo ne ziggwawo

Bayeekera nga byafaayo

Mmundu ne tuzisuula eri

Bbomu kugenda kimpoowooze

Masasi ne tukendeza

Ttanka ne tuzisaanyawo

Bakazi baggya nga bassa kimu

Nnyombo ne zifumwa bufumwa

Busungu ne bukendera

Okutu ne kukira ekkonde

Omunafu okusaaga n'agalina

Munaku agabana ne ba bifeekera

Omuddu n'alya ne nnyinimu

Kyeruppe ne Kaddugala

Kwagalana na kussa kimu

Ng'ekuyege z'omu kiswa

Njegere, tumenya mmenyemu

Nkomera ne tuzibumulula

Ne Katonda n'atukwatirako

Ensi eno n'emala ekyuka!

Awo we nazuukukira!

(Masagazi, Kitooke ne Kyagaba:35)

(b) Laga obwangu oba obuzibu bw'osisinkanye ng'ovuunula emboozi eyo.

(10 marks)

133

EKITUNDU C

Wano wammanga owereddwa emboozi za mirundi ebiri: A ne B. Emboozi mu kitundu A ejudde ebimiimo eby'awamu ate B yo tebirina. Soma emboozi zino:

(A)

OBUSAGWA BW'OMUSOTA.

Ssebo omulungi lw'obulawo

Omutima ne gunjigija

Ssebo ate lw' okomawo

Bwe nkulaba ne ndigida

Nfa essanyu ne limalawo

Lituuka ne mu nnaswi

Muli nzenna ne mpepeya

Bakisimba n'ekitiza

Okwagala kwo kwamalayo

Busagwa bwa musota

Buva we buyingidde

Wonna ne busaasana

Ate abasajja abeetawula

Nga baagala nkusule eri

Bibasaze nabaggalawo

Tewali nze alinsigula

Era nnyabo nze banveeko

134

Ebya magendo babiweera

Tambula nga weesunako

Olw'okuba nagaanirawo

Ggwe mwami wange gwe nonze

Tewali alikunzigyako.

Empafu bw'egwa wansi

Ekula era efuuka nje

Muli nzenna ne nkenena

Omutima ne gunduguda

Essanyu ne linziruka

Nyabo nzenna mpotoka

Ssebo oteranga n'okomawo

Omponye okusiwuuka

Ssebo otere okimanye

Nti obulamu buggwaawo

Ki kati ekyo ky'otomanyi?

Mbulira ekyo kye nkusobya

Ssebo olinda ani?

Nze nasalawo ndi wuwo

Embaga eri baawo ddi

Nkutokosezze etooke!

Okwagala kwo kwamalayo

Busagwa bw'omusota

Buva we buyingide wonna ne busaasaana.

(Ssematimba:08)

135

(B) AMANYI G'OMUKWANO.

Oli mulungi munange

Lw'obulawo nendwala

Omukwano gwaffe

Gwa manyi

Alitwaawula

Aliba mwana wa mwana.

Omukwano gusiiwa

Mpulira bubi nnyo

Nyamba omutima

Bambi omukwano gunuma

Nenkogga nenzigwerera

Gunuma nnyo

Omukwano gwenyina gyooli

Bwobulawo sseebaka

Nsula ntunula

Mazima wa mpangula.

Omukwano kwagala

Omukano kugumikiriza

Omukwano kuwaana

Omukwano kubibiita.

136

(b) Teeka akayini ku sentensi entuufu wammanga nga olaga kye tweyongerako oba ekibeerawo bwe tukozesa ebimiimo eby'awamu mu mboozi:

1. Emboozi nga terimu bimiimo ebeera eyongobeza era sikyangu okubera nga emboozi eyo ejjukirwa.

2. Ebimiimo eby'awamu biretera emboozi okubulamu ekiwomereze ekikyamusa era yelabirwa mangu ddala.

3. Mu bigambo ebitono ddala ebimiimo biraga obuziba bw'engeri gye tuwuliramu era bituletera okugatta empulira yaffe mu ngeri emu ku ndala.

4. Bwetukozesa ebimiimo eby'awamu, okugerageranya amakulu okuva mu bintu ebirala okubiteeka ku birala kituberera kyangu ddala.

5. Ebimiimo eby'awamu biteeka endowooza yaffe mu bumpimpi k'obere nga ky'olowooza kigazi nnyo.

6. Ebimiimo eby'awamu bituleetera okuteegera obulamu bwaffe n'ebyo ebitwetolodde okusinga ebigambo bwebiyinza okukola.

7. Ebimiimo eby'awamu biri wala nnyo ne bintu bye tulowoozaako mu bulamu bwaffe obwa bulijjo.

8. Ebimiimo eby'awamu bikendeeza ebintu ebiretera emboozi okubera ennyuvu era n'okusikiriza.

9. Ebimiimo eby'awamu biteeka amajolobera ku lulimi era ne bikwata ku ngeri gye tuwuliramu ey'ebuziba.

10. Ebimiimo eby'awamu bintu bya lulimi eby'eddennyo era byaava dda ku mulembe, tebikyetagisa mu kwogera.

11. Abatontomi nga bakozesa ebimiimo eby'awamu mu ngeri eyekikuggu ddala basimoggola ebintu ebinene eby'obulamu bwaffe era ne bakuba omumuli nga bagaziya, bekebejja ekigenze ddala awala embeera yaffe eya bulijjo.

12. Abakozesa ebimiimo eby'awamu tebasobola kwogera nga basukulumya ebimiimo eby'awamu okujjako bino naffe bye tumanyi. (10 marks)

Appendix C: List of oral sources

1. Dr. Emmanuel Muranga   Institute of Languages Makerere University.

2. Dr. Susan Kiguli   Department of Literature Faculty of Arts.

3. Dr. Dr. Kiingi   Institute of Languages Makerere University

4. Bukenya Lino   Nkozi University.

Appendix D: Marking guide for the tests

SECTION A APPENDIX A

(a). SENTENCES WITH A METAPHORICAL KEY IDEA.

1. Look how far we have come.

2. It has been a long bumpy road

3. We cannot turn back now.

4. We are at crossroads.

5. We may have to go our separate ways.

6. The relationship is not going anywhere.

7. We are spinning our wheels.

8. Our relationship is off the track.

9. The marriage is on the rocks.

10. We are spinning our wheels.

(b)   LOVE IS A JOURNEY METAPHOR.   (10 marks)

(B)

  (a)   1. Her beauty is a golden sun setting over rolling hills.

        2. I was bowled over by his charm and good looks.

        3. Her beauty is the rising sun over a crystal area.

        4. That girl is an absolute knockout.

        5. He is drop-dead gorgeous.

        6. Beauty is a child tenderly kissing her grandmother's wrinkled face.

7. Their new singer is really hot.

8. His wife is a spring flower blossoming after the rain.

9. His voice is the sound of milk running over silk.

10. Beauty is a lawn full of dandelions.

(b)   BEAUTY METAPHORS.   (10 marks)

(C)

      i. 1. He is climbing the ladder.

          2. He is a blood-thirsty despot.

          3. She is moving up in the ranks

          4. France rules the air.

          5. She is an iron-fisted demagogue.

          6. Britain is the king of the waves.

          7. The lion rules the jungle.

          8. He clawed his way to the top.

          9. Blood and iron will solve the great question of the day.

          10. His sweat and tears were not given moments of regard.

     ii.   RULE AND GOVERNANCE METAPHORS.

SECTION B

(a)

(A)

Nkwaagala nnyo, kabiite wange;

Nkwagala nnyo, kabiite wange

Okwagala kwange ge mata ag'e Kenya agatafa

Ge wannywa ku mbaga y'obugole.

Okwagala kwange ye munyenye y'okumakya;

Gy'osooka okulaba ng'ozukuse

Omukwano gwange ke kasana akeberyberye,

Akasiikula okwagala mu mitima gyaffe

Oli kimuli kya looza

Ekijjuza obulamu bwange bwona akaloosa

Nzena ne mpepeya

Bwenkuyimbira amaziga g'essanyu ne gampangula

Olw'okuba onsula ku mutwe nga nviri:

Nkwagala nnyo kabiite wange.

(B)

Nalulungi w'ensi yonna.

Antuula ku luseggere, nalulungi w'ensi eno

Omulungi eyatuukirira okuva kagere paka ku luviri

Atalina ky'oyinza kunnyoma bwomutunulako

Oli kaalaala okukira amakula g'ebuyonani

Maama nnyabo! Asanira kukweeka buziba

Gye bataatuka, okugyako nze nzekka

Nga buli bwemulaba nendigida

Nnamala ankyaawa abanjagaliza

Kugenda kagaanga

Yawangula emeeme yange, ate okuligitta kwa

Maaso ge mukiwanga kwe kubizaala!

Kyoka sisobola kwerekereza bulungi obwo

Kyempitamu kinsanyusa, wade ninga agwaawo

Obulungi bwe okutali kamogo teri atamutunulira

Asinga feeza ne zaabu w'ensi yonna

Katino tambula ndabe mulongo wange

Tambula olumye buli kiramu

Emunyeenye yange, essanyu

Ly'omutima ggwange

Ensi yonna ekukaaba.

(C)
Sseruganda, Wulira Bino.

Sseruganda, Ebintu ebivaamu

Obulamu obweyaggaza

Bulina kuba bukulembeze buno

Bwendaba:

Ensigalira y'ebyobugagga

Ebifuniddwa ku kakeeka

Obugagga bw'ensi eno

Emeeme enteefu;

Ow'oluganda owa nnamadala;

Teri nkayana wadde

Okwelumaluma

Tewali kunyigiriza wadde

Endwaddwe wabula

Obulamu obweyagaza

Embeera nebeera bweetyo;

Nga tewali bitali bituufu

Wabula amagezi okolera

Wamu n'obukakamu

Ba kirimegga nga

Tebazitoowelerwa nga teri

Kunnywa ku gangayira

Omukyala omwesigwa

Nga tewali kukayana

Nga wonna ntende

Olwo buli omu affune

Obuwerero teri atya kuffa

Wadde ejjogo lyakwo.   (10 marks)

SECTION C

(a) THE EFFECTS OF USING METAPHORS IN DISCOURSE.

1. Without fresh and careful metaphor, your discourse is likely to lack the vitality and surprise that might make them memorable.

2. With a few words the metaphorical device communicates the emotions and associations from one context with objects and entities in a different context.

3. Metaphor suffuses our thoughts, no matter what we are thinking about.

4. Metaphor allows us to understand ourselves and our world in ways that no other modes of thought can.

5. Great poets can speak to us because they use the modes of thought we all possess, using the capacities we all share, poets can illuminate our experience, explore, the consequences of our beliefs, challenge the ways we think and criticize our ideologies.

6. Metaphor appeals to our deepest modes of everyday understanding and forces us to use them in new ways.

7. Metaphor helps us to understand our own world views and the processes that guide both our everyday understanding and our imagination.

8. It lends to discourse ornamentation and deals with central and indispensable aspects of our conceptual systems.

9. Through the masterful use of metaphoric processes on which our conceptual systems are based, poets address the most vital issues in our lives and help us illuminate those issues through the extension, composition and criticism of the basic metaphoric tools through which we comprehend much of reality.

10. Poets can appeal to the ordinary metaphors we live by in order to take us beyond them to make us more insightful than we would be if we thought only in the standard ways.

(10 marks)

Appendix E: Marking guide for the test

EKITUNDU A

(A)

(a) SENTENSI OMULI EBIMIIMO EBY'AWAMU.

1. Tuyise mu biwonvu ne mu migga.

2. Tusisinkanye amayengo mangi.

3. Tuyise ku busozi ne ku miseetwe.

4. Tuli mu masanganzira.

5. Tuvuunuse emiyaga mingi.

6. Tuyise awaziyivu.

7. Tutambulidde ku maggwa mangi.

8. Tuvudde mu manyo ga mpologoma.

9. Tuyise mu manyo ga mpisi.

10. Okwagalana kwaffe kutambulidde mu bisiriko.

(b) Okwagalana lubeera lugendo.   (10 marks)

(B)

(a)

1. Mulungi lwondo.

2. Maaso mbira.

3. Maaso ndege.

4. Mugoggofu.

5. Kijujuulu.

6. Obulungi nvannungi.

7. Maaso ttala.

8. Mulungi tasangika.

9. Abalungi ndagalannamu.

10. Abalungi mbwa za nnamaaso.

(b)   Ebimiimo ebikwata ku bulungi.   (10 marks)

(C)

(a)

1. Lusibira mubbwa.

2. Afuga bumbula.

3. Akutte enkasi.

4. Afugisa mukono gwa kyuuma.

5. Atudde ku Nnamulondo.

6. Mufuzi kijambiya.

7. Afuga kijambula.

8. Akooza kagiri.

9. Azinya ngera.

10. Atuntuza.

(b)   Ebimiimo ebikwata ku bufuzi n'obukulembeze.   (10 marks)

EKITUNDU B

MY ENCOUNTER WITH BIRUNGI TEBIKKA MIREMBE.

From my half conscious state, a sigh, born out of great enthusiasm went out of my grasp, and I welcomed Mirembe. Her physical form delighted the aesthetic senses: medium sized, slightly built, chocolate-coloured with a round shape, crafted and curved with the comeliness and gorgeousness that made her an eyeful stunner.

Her winsome eyes magically rotated in their sockets making my heart miss a beat, she had an artistic forehead, with good looking eyebrows, her conical mouth, and perfect teeth punctuated with an upfront chink were awesome. She had the fairest cheeks and when she opted for a smile or laughter, she would light the whole world.

Her round neck was resplendent and prepossessing. She was a goddess with a hand gifted with glamorous fingers. She had a cute pair of feet. Her legs were divinely rickety and she had a strange rolling and graceful gait like a sailor on the ship. Despite her slender stature and form, she was full of grandeur and wit with unparalleled warm-heartedness. She was an absolute excellent woman.

(B) THE WOMAN IS A JEWEL

Women under the sun are flowers

Attractive flowers to behold

Women of the land are precious flowers

Flowers we yearn to jealously hoard

The charming appearance is an

Attribute of a beauteous woman

An enviable down to earth character

Is second nature to a beautiful woman.

The magnificent upfront chink

Reveals this beauty's treasure

A beguiling scent defines a

A woman of great cleanliness.

Women of the land sire treasures

They bring unparalleled tranquility

They are the custodians of wealth

They bring wealth they take my fancy

Women of this land cultivate

And only grow the desirables

Disciplinarians of a sort rare to find

A well mulched garden pertains

To a precious woman

A marvelous woman is calm by nature

A gentle woman is analogous to a fruitful garden

Producing fruit in due season

Is a woman of great beauty.

A woman speaks and speaks only carefully

Curving every word before she lets it fall

Her looks are traffic arresting

Her smile a radiant gleam

Her gait of a lovely nature

They are worth every nicety!

Women under the sun are a marvel

For their amazing deeds

Woe unto the unmarried

For they miss their charm

For those with marital intentions

Quicken your footsteps

Without women what a boring

World would it be!

(C)   THE UTOPIAN WORLD ORDER

In a split second I got a dream!

The lamb and the wolf enjoying one game

The dog and the cat alike

The world leaders speaking one language

The subordinates living in harmony

Nations enjoying cordial relations

Bush and Saddam were of one accord

Kabila entertaining Mobutu

America and Libya were inseparable allies

Wars and battles a thing of the past

Rebels and militias unheard of

Guns thrown overboard

Bombs disappearing in thin air

Bullets and ammunitions curtailed

War tanks demolished

Co wives in consonance

Squabbles remaining on paper

Outrage overcome

Listening to each other instead of fighting

The weak and strong enjoying friendly relations

The poor and rich sharing together

The slave and master given equal treatment

The whites and blacks living in harmony

Like red ants

Leveling all barriers

Surmounting all hurdles

With the divine intervention

If the world order ever changed

Then I rose up!

EKITUNDU C

KINO KYEKIBEERAWO BWETUKOZESA EBIMIIMO EBY'AWAMU MU MBOOZI.

1. Emboozi nga terimu bimiimo ebeera eyongobeza era sikyangu okubeera nga ejjukirwa.

2. Mu bigambo ebitono ddala ebimiimo biraga obuziba bw'engeri gye tuwuliramu era bituletera okugatta empulira yaffe mu engeri emu kundala.

3. Bwetukozesa ebimiimo eby'awamu, okugerageranya amakulu okuva mu bintu ebirala okubiteeka ku birala kituberera kyangu ddala.

4. Ebimiimo eby'awamu biteeka endowooza yaffe mu bumpimpi k'obere nga ky'olowooza kigazi nnyo.

5. Ebimiimo eby'awamu bituleetera okuteegera obulamu bwaffe n'ebyo ebitwetolodde okusinga ebigambo bwebiyinza okukola.

6. Ebimiimo eby'awamu biteeka amajolobera ku lulimi era ne bikwata ku ngeri gye tuwuliramu ey'ebuziba.

7. Abatontomi nga bakozesa ebimiimo eby'awamu mu ngeri eyekikugu ddala basimoggola ebintu ebinene ebizito eby'obulamu bwaffe era ne bakuba nga bagaziya, nga bekebejja ekigenze awala embeera yaffe eya bulijjo.

8. Abakozesa ebimiimo eby'awamu basobola okwogera nga basukulumya amakulu g'ebintu bino naffe byetumanyi.

9. Ebimiimo eby'awamu biretera emboozi okuberamu ekiwomereze ekikyamusa era essanyusa abajiwulira.

10. Ebimiimo eby'awamu bintu bya lulimi ebya bulijjo era bwe tubikozesa tulaga obukugu bwaffe mu lulimi.

Appendix F: Introductory letter

<div align="center">

MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGES

</div>

Date…………………………………..

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: FRANCIS JJEMBA

This is to introduce you to the person named above. He is a second year Masters student doing M.A Linguistics. He is on research and we request that you give him necessary assistance.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Wangotta Michael

DEPUTY DIRECTOR, MIL

Appendix G: List of Schools

1. A
2. B
3. C
4. D
5. E
6. F
7. G
8. H
9. I
10. J
11. K
12. L
13. M
14. N

Appendix G: Raw scores obtained from marking

ID	First language	ENG/Literature exposure	Lug exposure	Taught languages	Teach_experience	Cog_met_Eng[1]	Translat_met_Eng[2]	Impct_met_Eng[3]	Cog_met_Lug[4]	Translat_met_Lug[5]	Impct_met_Lug[6]
1	Lug	.	Degree	Both	1-5 yrs	15	6	0	11	2	0
2	Lug	.	Degree	Both	6-10 yrs	18.5	4	1	27	4	9
3	Lug	Degree	.	Lug only	1-5 yrs	10	2	0	3	2	9
4	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	16-20 yrs	4	.	10	15	.	11
5	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	> 20 yrs	14	.	12	14	.	12
6	Lug	Degree	Degree	Lug only	6-10 yrs	30	4	5	30	4	5
7	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	22	.	9	18	.	9
8	Lug	.	Diploma	Lug only	6-10 yrs	15	8	10	26	8	7
9	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	> 20 yrs	14	6	10	15	2	8
10	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	9	8	10	9	8	10
11	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	19	2	7	19	2	7
12	ENG	Diploma	.	Both	16-20 yrs	25.5	6	7	27	2	9
13	Lug	PGD	.	ENG only	16-20 yrs	15	9	11	24	6	10
14	Others	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	29	1	12	29	1	12
15	Others	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	24	1	7	24	1	7
16	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	12	.	12	12	.	12
17	Lug	.	Diploma	Lug only	6-10 yrs	0	0	11	0	0	11
18	Lug	.	Degree	Lug only	1-5 yrs	14	.	0	28	.	8
19	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	11	6	.	25	6	.
20	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	1-5 yrs	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	Lug	.	Degree	Both	1-5 yrs	4	2	6	4	2	11
23	Lug	.	Degree	Both	6-10 yrs	20	4	3	2	4	3
24	Lug	Degree	.	Lug only	1-5 yrs	13	4	0	15	4	0
25	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	16-20 yrs	14	3	9	4	3	12
26	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	> 20 yrs	28	4	8	16	4	6
27	Lug	Degree	Degree	Lug only	6-10 yrs	20	2	9	15	3	11
28	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	25	2	11	28	2	11
29	Lug	.	Diploma	Lug only	6-10 yrs	15	2	7	15	4	6
30	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	> 20 yrs	17	2	10	14	2	10
31	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	15	2	7	15	2	7
32	Lug	Degree	.	ENG	1-5 yrs	13	4	6	15	4	11

				only							
33	ENG	Diploma	.	Both	16-20 yrs	9	2	8	15	4	10
34	Lug	PGD	.	ENG only	16-20 yrs	15	10	9	15	4	11
35	Others	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	17	9	10	30	4	10
36	Others	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	23.5	2	6	28	3	8
37	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	19	4	5	16	6	6
38	Lug	.	Diploma	Lug only	6-10 yrs	28	8	3	15	2	12
39	Lug	.	Degree	Lug only	1-5 yrs	14	2	8	15	3	11
40	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	26.5	8	7	30	4	7
41	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	1-5 yrs	17	2	9	17	4	8
42	Lug	.	Diploma	Lug only	6-10 yrs	15	5	6	9	3	6
43	Lug	.	Degree	Lug only	1-5 yrs	9	4	12	14	4	12
44	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	10	4	12	15	4	11
45	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	1-5 yrs	12	0	.	25	2	.
46	Lug	.	Degree	Both	1-5 yrs	21	2	11	30	2	7
47	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	9	8	10	9	8	10
48	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	19	2	7	19	2	0
49	ENG	Diploma	.	Both	16-20 yrs	25.5	6	7	27	2	9
50	Lug	PGD	.	ENG only	16-20 yrs	15	9	11	24	6	10
51	Lug	.	Degree	Lug only	1-5 yrs	14	.	0	28	.	8
52	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	11	6	.	25	6	.
53	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	1-5 yrs	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	Lug	.	Degree	Both	1-5 yrs	4	2	6	4	2	11
55	Lug	.	Degree	Both	6-10 yrs	20	4	3	2	4	3
56	Lug	Degree	.	Lug only	1-5 yrs	13	4	0	15	4	0
57	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	16-20 yrs	14	3	9	4	3	12
58	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	> 20 yrs	28	4	8	16	4	6
59	Lug	Degree	Degree	Lug only	6-10 yrs	20	2	9	15	3	11
60	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	25	2	11	28	2	11
61	Lug	.	Diploma	Lug only	6-10 yrs	15	2	7	15	4	6
62	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	> 20 yrs	17	2	10	14	2	10
63	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	15	2	7	15	2	7
64	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	13	4	6	15	4	11
65	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	19	4	5	16	6	6
66	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	1-5 yrs	17	2	9	17	4	8
67	Lug	.	Diploma	Lug only	6-10 yrs	15	5	6	9	3	6
68	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	6-10 yrs	10	4	12	15	4	11
69	Lug	Degree	Diploma	Lug only	1-5 yrs	12	0	.	25	2	.

70	Lug	Degree	.	ENG only	1-5 yrs	25	2	11	28	2	11
71	Lug	.	Diploma	Lug only	6-10 yrs	15	2	7	15	4	6

[1]Cognizance of metaphors in discourse (Luganda)

[2]Interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse (English)

[3]Impact of metaphors in discourse (English)

[4]Cognizance of metaphors in discourse (Luganda)?

[5]Interlingual translatability of metaphors in discourse (Luganda)?

[6]Impact of metaphors in discourse (Luganda)