METAPHOR USE IN THE DUTCH ELECTIONS OF 2017

Munneke, T. (Thom)
S4481062
Bachelor thesis
G. Reijnierse
June, 6th, 2017

Introduction

Politicians are known to use a lot of metaphors to make their messages more persuasive and understandable for the voter (Johnson & Taylor, 1981; Charteris-Black, 2004; Michira, 2014). For example, at his inauguration speech when becoming the 45th president of the United States, Donald J. Trump used the words "this American carnage" to describe the current situation in the Unites States ("President Donald Trump inauguration speech", 2017). By using words associated with terms of war ("carnage"), Trump aimed to make the complex national problems, such as immigration and gun-violence, comprehensible for the voter. Furthermore, by using a metaphor related to war, Trump displayed the seriousness of these problems.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 125) state that "the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another". Thus, a metaphor is a way of speaking and writing to make abstract subjects like national economics or immigration more specific, concrete and comprehensible for the listener. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) furthermore introduced the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), which states that metaphors are not only linguistic in nature, but also conceptual and furthermore that such metaphors have a source- and a target domain. The target domain consists of terms or subjects which are abstract and often difficult to comprehend. These abstract terms, such as politics, love and economics, are made more comprehensible by using terms from other domains, which are more specific such as war or a game of chess. These concrete terms are considered the source domain. For instance, in the sentence: 'politics is war', the term 'politics' is fairly abstract and difficult to imagine and comprehend and is therefore considered the target domain. The term 'war' is considered the source domain, as it explains the abstract term 'politics' in the target domain with a more specific term.

Edelman (1971) states that certain abstract terms or issues are simplified by using a metaphor, resulting in a more concrete meaning which can ultimately result in a better understanding of these terms and issues. Furthermore, Edelman (1971) indicates that metaphors contain a certain persuasiveness, due to the fact that they evoke certain thoughts and feelings in the listener. As persuasiveness in speech plays an important role in winning votes (Johnson & Taylor, 1981; Charteris-Black, 2004; Michira, 2014), party leaders could therefore consider using metaphors in debates and speeches.

Besides the assumption that the persuasiveness of a message is increased by means of metaphor use, the vividness of a message could also be enhanced, as a study by Michira (2014) suggested. Analyzing the presidential campaign in Nigeria in 2013, this study

concluded that metaphors are very powerful tools which can persuade the listener, but also excite them and provide them with knowledge about certain subjects. For instance, presidential candidate Raila Odinga used metaphors which were related to football, as he considered himself a football fan and football itself is a popular sport played in Kenya. More than just using metaphors related to football, Odinga told a story in a speech where he scored a goal which turned out to be invalid as he was off-side. Using this story to describe politics has several functions (Michira, 2014). Firstly, comparing football with politics makes it easier for the listener to understand how politics work. Political parties were described as football teams, in which every member has a different role to play (striker, defender, keeper). Secondly, using football imagery shows the listener and voter that Odinga is a team player, and goals (winning the elections) can only be achieved when team members work together. Finally, stating that the goal he scored in his story was invalid due to him being off-side, gives him the opportunity to tell the voters why he didn't win the previous elections of 2007. Him being off-side is a direct reference to the loss of the 2007 elections, which he alleged was fraud by the then ruling government. Using imagery of normal day subjects like football enhances the vividness and understandability of the message, as well as the excitement by the listener (Michira, 2014).

Although the studies mentioned above conclude that metaphors are very powerful tools in persuasion and manipulation of the listener, a variety of studies contradict each other when it comes to subdividing metaphors into different metaphor categories. A study by Cammaerts (2012) aimed to categorize metaphors by examining political speeches in the Belgium constitutional crisis of 2007. In this study, the identification and categorization of metaphors was based on Critical Metaphor Analysis, which was introduced by Charteris-Black (2004). This method of analyzing metaphors in political contexts consists of three stages, namely identifying the metaphors, interpreting the metaphors and explanation of the metaphors. Firstly, identifying metaphors was based on "whether a word or phrase is used with a sense that differs from another more common or more basic sense as demonstrated by identifying a source domain that differs from the target domain" (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 45). Secondly, the identified metaphors were interpreted using the Conceptual Methaphor Theory, as explained in Lakoff & Johnson (1980). This approach states that the use of certain metaphors partly arises from the unconscious emotional associations which individuals have with the words of the metaphor. For instance, if an individual has negative memories of a war due to a youth trauma, the individual will evaluate metaphors including the word war in a negative way, and is less likely to use this word in a metaphorical way. Gaining knowledge of

certain unconscious emotions in this stage is essential for the final stage of metaphor analysis, which is explaining why certain metaphors are used in the context. As the final step in the Critical Metaphor Analysis by Charteris-Black (2004), the identified and interpreted metaphors were explained, meaning that the underlying intentions of using a certain metaphor by the politician are identified. The analysis of the underlying intentions is based on the unconscious emotions of the speaker, amongst other factors such as their political viewpoints. This analysis results in a clear image why the politician in question uses certain metaphors and why this specific metaphor is used in this specific context.

Analyzing the metaphors in political speeches in the Belgium constitutional crisis of 2007, Cammaerts (2012) distinguished four meta-categories in which metaphors could be categorized, based on the frequency in which they occurred in the speeches. These categories were *metaphors related to sports and games*, *metaphors related to war*, *culinary metaphors* and *metaphors related to transportation*. However, distinguishing the four metaphor categories was only based on the number of metaphors which used the same source domain. This means that the four metaphor categories were only distinguished as a category due to the fact a high number of metaphors related to sports and games, war, transportation and food were identified in the speeches. Therefore, this method of distinguishing categories is not very reliable and consistent. For instance, if a politician uses a great number of metaphors related to technology due to his passion for this subject, a new category of metaphors related to technology would be distinguished. This category might be a metaphor category on his own in speeches of the politician in question, but would not be distinguished in speeches by politicians who do not use a great number of technology related metaphors. Thus, metaphor categories based on the frequency in which the metaphors related to the category occur, depend on the word and metaphor choices of the politician and therefore cannot be applied to all political speeches. Moreover, a great number of categories could not be identified due to the fact that metaphors have a wide variety of source domains to which they can be related. For instance, the metaphor "Talking about the elephant in the room" could not be placed in one of the categories, as the source domain of this metaphor is related to animals and not to the topics of the categories (war, games, culinary and transportation). Thus, consistently categorizing metaphors would require more aspects than their frequency in the text. For instance, metaphors could be categorized according to the emotions they provoke. Metaphors which provoke emotions such as anger or happiness can be distinguished as different metaphor categories. Furthermore, the four categories drawn in Cammaerts (2012) were closely related to the history of Belgium, as metaphors such as "the trenches", which was

frequently used by Belgian politicians, directly refer to World War I. Therefore, it raises the question if the identified categories in Cammaerts (2012) can be applied in political contexts outside of Belgium.

De Landtsheer (2009) distinguished six categories of metaphors which can be applied to political contexts. The sequence of these categories was based on their increasing emotional potential, meaning that politicians use metaphors which have more impact if the listener is less in control of the situation. On the contrary, less powerful metaphors are used by politicians if the listener is more in control of the situation. For instance, in situations which can be easily controlled by the individual, e.g. politicians persuading people to cast a vote during the elections, politicians will use weaker metaphors than in situations which are out of individuals' control, e.g. illegal immigration. The six metaphor categories drawn by De Landtsheer (2009) are 'everyday metaphors' (metaphors known and used by the majority of the speakers of a language, such as "He sold his soul for greater political influence"), metaphors related to nature, metaphors related to navigation, metaphors related to natural disasters like tsunami's, metaphors related to sports and games, and metaphors related to the human body. Furthermore, these categories increase in their emotional potential, of which the "everyday metaphors" have the least emotional potential and metaphors related to the human body have the greatest emotional potential, due to the fact that the latter category is known to evoke more or stronger emotions in the listener (De Landtsheer, 2009).

De Landtsheer, Kalkhoven and Broen (2011), analyzed the metaphor use of Dutch far-right politician Geert Wilders, drawing on the six distinguished categories by De Landtsheer (2009). The results of the study showed that the political ideology of Geert Wilders has a significant impact on the way this politician uses metaphors. Metaphors which fit far-right and populist themes, such as the common people vs. the corrupt political elite (Mudde, 2004), are commonly used in opinion articles and columns of Geert Wilders. For instance, the far-right theme mass immigration is mentioned a total of 12 times in his columns and opinion articles, while the theme about a healthier environment is mentioned once. Besides covering a variety of far-right and populist themes, Wilders also uses a strongly metaphorical way of speech, according to the metaphor index (De Landtsheer, 2009). This means that the columns and opinion articles of Wilders included a high number of metaphors per 100 words which furthermore scored high on emotional potential. A total of 274 metaphors were identified in the opinion articles of Wilders, of which 24 were related to the human body and had the greatest emotional potential. For instance, in one of his opinion articles, Wilders wrote '"Land of peace" is the medicine based on the wrong diagnosis". This sentence alone contained

multiple metaphors (e.g. medicine and diagnosis) which also had the highest emotional potential (related to the human body). Thus resulting in a high score of metaphorical power of the text. These results indicate that politicians with a far-right political viewpoint tend to use a great number of metaphors which score high on their emotional potential. It can be hypothesized that the extensive use of metaphors is due to the extremity of the political viewpoint, namely far-right. If this hypothesis is proven to be true, it can be hypothesized that politicians with a far-left point of view will also extensively use metaphors in texts. Therefore, comparisons in the use of metaphors between politicians with a right and left political point of view have to be conducted.

Furthermore, the nature of the metaphors, either negative, positive or neither, should be considered, as they might influence the way the message is received by the voters. A study by Johnson and Taylor (1981) showed that using positive or negative metaphors in a message influenced the political attitudes of the voters. In this study, 72 participants had to read four news articles which involved political figures or political events. These articles were modified in a way that two of the four news articles made use of a positive valence, while the other two articles made use of a negative valence. The difference between positive and negative valence can be described as follows. Articles with a positive valence used metaphors which evaluated the featured political figure in a positive way, such as "he was squinting like a kind grandfather viewing his assembled grandchildren" (Johnson & Taylor, 1981, p. 309). Articles with a negative valence used metaphors which evaluated the featured political figure in a negative manner, such as "he was squinting like a careful hoarder counting his change" (Johnson & Taylor, 1981, p. 309). The results of the study showed that subjects reading a positive metaphor rated the person and issue mentioned in a more desirable light, while a negative metaphor resulted in a negative rating of the person and issue. However, for this to be true, the subject had to be politically sophisticated, meaning that the subject had both knowledge of and interest in the politician or the political news article. Participants who were politically sophisticated, were significantly more influenced by the use of positive and negative metaphors regarding their attitude towards the person or issue in question than participants who were not politically sophisticated (Johnson & Taylor, 1981). Therefore, the results of Johnson and Taylor (1981) indicate that there is a relation between the use of positive or negative metaphors to describe a political figure in news articles, and the attitude of the reader towards these political figures. Thus, it can be suggested that the use of positive and negative metaphors can enhance the persuasiveness of the message towards politically sophisticated listeners. Due to the fact that the persuasiveness of a message might be

enhanced by using positive and negative metaphors, it can be hypothesized that politicians who have a positive attitude towards a certain subject, will use more positive metaphors in order to be more persuasive towards the listener. On the contrary, politicians who have a negative attitude towards a subject are likely to use more negative metaphors.

The use of metaphors might differ between subjects of debate in politics. As certain political subjects are characteristic for certain political parties, opinions about these subject might differ in strength between parties. For instance, Dutch politician Jesse Klaver, leader of the socialist-left and environmental GreenLeft, has a stronger opinion about the environment than Mark Rutte, leader of the liberal-right Peoples Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD). GreenLeft elaborately covers the subject of the environment and climate change, while the VVD barely mentioned it in their program. It is likely that party leaders will put in more effort in defending their position in debates when the subject is important to them, while less effort is expected if they think that the subject is less important. Therefore, the use of metaphors is expected to be higher when the topic of debate is considered important by the party leader. On the contrary, the use of fewer metaphors is expected when the topic of debate is not considered important by the party leader.

The current study aims to determine if there is a significant relation between the political point of view of the party leader (socialist-left or liberal-right) and the number and nature of metaphors used in debates (positive, negative, neutral), drawing on the following research questions:

RQ1: *To what extent is there a difference in the use of metaphors between liberal-right VVD and socialist-left GreenLeft regarding the social topic immigration?*

Party representatives might be influenced by their attitude toward the subject in their use of positive and negative metaphors during debates. In order to determine if there are significant differences in the use of positive, negative and neutral metaphors between party leaders with different attitudes and points of view on a subject, the following research question was formulated:

RQ2: *To what extent is there a difference in the use of positive, negative and neutral metaphors between liberal-right VVD and socialist-left GreenLeft regarding the social topic immigration?*

Results of earlier studies (De Landtsheer, 2009; Cammaerts, 2012) show that categorizing metaphors can be difficult, as these studies each distinguished different metaphor categories. In order to get a better insight in possible metaphor categories in the current study, the following research question was drawn:

RQ3: *To what extent is there a difference between the types of metaphors between liberal-right VVD and socialist-left GreenLeft?*

Ultimately, the types of positive and negative metaphors used might have similarities or differences between both party leaders. Aiming to identify certain patterns in the use of positive, negative and neutral metaphors, the following research question was drawn:

RQ4: *To what extent is there a difference between the types of positive and negative metaphors between liberal-right VVD and socialist-left GreenLeft regarding the social topic immigration?*

In order to determine if there is a significant difference in metaphor use between socialist-left and liberal-right parties, two political parties were chosen, namely the Peoples Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) which is a liberal-right party and GreenLeft (GroenLinks) which is a socialist-left party. These parties strongly deviate in opinion regarding issues in Dutch society and their solutions. The difference between socialist-left and liberal-right parties can be described using the following definition: "Socialist-left parties are in favor of the government playing a bigger role in and having a greater influence on society, while liberal-right parties want to keep the role and influence of the government limited" (Parlement & Politiek, n.d.). As GreenLeft states on their website that they are a socialist-left party, they were therefore considered the socialist-left party in this study. On the contrary, the VVD was considered liberal-right in this study, as their official website states that the VVD is "a liberal party" (VVD, n.d.) and the majority of their political points of view are in line with liberal-right definition of "limited government influence on society" (Parlement & Politiek, n.d.). As politicians often use metaphors to make a topic more understandable and persuade the listener (Johnson & Taylor, 1981; Charteris-Black, 2004; Michira, 2014), it is expected that more metaphors are used when party leaders are debating about subjects on which they have a strong opinion. Due to the fact that the subject of debate in the current study is immigration, which is considered a typical VVD subject, the following hypothesis was drawn:

H1. *Mark Rutte (VVD) will use more metaphors than Jesse Klaver (GreenLeft)*

Furthermore, it is expected that if party leaders have a positive attitude towards the topic of debate, they will use more positive metaphors (metaphors supporting their political point of view) while a negative attitude towards the topic will result in the use of more negative metaphors (metaphors criticizing the opponents' point of view). More specifically, if party leaders want to draw negative attention towards a subject of debate due to their negative attitude towards the subject, it is expected that they will use more negative metaphors. On the contrary, if party leaders want to weaken or draw positive attention towards subjects of debate, it is expected that more positive metaphors will be used. The subject of the final debate between Mark Rutte and Jesse Klaver was immigration, which was considered a typical VVD subject, as Mark Rutte choose this topic himself and immigration is one of VVD's main points in their political program. Therefore, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H2. *Mark Rutte (VVD) will use more positive metaphors than Jesse Klaver (GreenLeft)*

No specific hypothesis were formulated regarding the types of metaphor categories and the types of positive, negative and neutral metaphors used by the politicians, as earlier studies do not provide enough information about categorizing metaphors in order to make assumptions.

Method

Materials

The materials for this study consisted of a spoken debate between the party representatives of the Peoples Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) and GreenLeft (GroenLinks). The debate, called 'het slotdebat' (the final debate) took place the day before the elections, on March 14th, 2017. Every party leader had to choose one subject of debate several weeks before the final debate, and was randomly assigned to another party leader with whom they had to debate about the chosen subject. The reason why the final debate was included in the study was due to the fact that the VVD had chosen the subject of immigration and was assigned to debate with GreenLeft. This debate would therefore be between a socialist-left and liberal-right party, in which similarities and/or differences in the use of metaphors between these political viewpoints could be clearly identified. The party leader and representative of the VVD was Mark Rutte, and the party leader and representative of GreenLeft was Jesse Klaver.

As the VVD chose immigration as the subject of the debate and is known to have a strong opinion about this subject and often broach the subject in debates and interviews, it is expected that Mark Rutte will use more metaphors than Jesse Klaver. The differences in opinion about immigration between the VVD and GreenLeft could be described as follows. GreenLeft thinks that all refugees from unstable countries such as Syria should be welcome in the Netherlands and are willing to provide them with emergency shelter, food and education. The VVD, on the other hand, thinks that the number of refugees should be regulated or reduced, and emergency shelter should be organized in neighboring countries instead of in the Netherlands.

Besides the fact that both parties deviate in opinion over this social issue, choosing this topic was also based on recent research by the National Instance of Statistics (CBS), which showed that the majority of the Dutch residents consider this topic as one of the most important in the 2017 Dutch political elections. As the number of refugees coming to the Netherlands has spiked in the last years (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2017), immigration has become a popular subject of discussion in the chamber of representatives as well as in society itself.

Procedure

      For this research to be conducted effectively, several concepts of the research question had to be explained elaborately and operationalized. Firstly, the final debate broadcasted on national television was carefully transcribed (excluding flaws in speaking such as "uh"). Thereafter, the transcripts were POS-tagged using the Natural Language Processing (NLP) program Frog (Van den Bosch, Busser, Daelemans & Canisius, 2007). This program identified all the words in the transcripts and categorized them according to their word class (e.g. noun, verb, and adverb). Subsequently, a manual analysis was conducted in which only the content words (nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs) were selected. Words in these word classes have a lexical meaning on their own, in contrast with function words, which have 'little lexical meaning and express grammatical relationships with other words within a sentence' (Wikipedia, 2017). As one of the main aims of using metaphors is to simplify complex terms in the target domain, much simpler terms are needed. The simpler terms of the source domain require content words as they have a lexical meaning and directly refer to objects, in order to provide a sufficient understanding of the target domain. The identification of nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs as a metaphors was based on the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP), introduced by the Pragglejaz Group (2007). The Metaphor Identification Procedure provides the following instructions to identify metaphors in natural language (Pragglejaz Group, 2007, p. 3):

"

1. Read the entire text/discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.

2. Determine the lexical units in the text/discourse

3a. For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, i.e., how it applies to an entity, relation or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.

3b. For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be:

     – more concrete; what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste.

     – related to bodily action.

– more precise (as opposed to vague).

– historically older. Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

3c. If the lexical unit has a more basic current/contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical. "

The inter-coder reliability was measured based on a total of 911 content words from the corpus, which were analyzed independently by two coders. The inter-coder reliability of the variable Metaphor was fair ($\kappa = .39$, $p < .001$; Landis & Koch, 1977, p. 165). Despite the fact that the inter-coder reliability was fairly low, no changes in the corpus were made.

After all metaphors in the transcripts were identified, the nature of the metaphor (positive or negative) was determined on a contextual basis. Metaphors were categorized as positive if they supported or strengthened the point that the politician in question was making. For instance, 'rock steady' in the metaphorical sentence "The policy of our party on economics is rock steady" is considered a positive metaphor, as it supports the (political) point of view of the speaker. On the contrary, metaphors were categorized as negative if they question or weaken the point that the opponent is making. For instance, 'a whirlwind of destruction' in the sentence "The policy of your party on economics only causes a whirlwind of destruction" is considered a negative metaphor, as it weakens the point of the opponent and puts it in a bad light. If a metaphor did not strengthen the point the politician was making or did not weaken the point the opposing politician was making, the nature of the metaphor was categorized as neutral. For instance, 'lifted to' in the sentence "Immigrants were lifted to the Western world" is considered a neutral metaphor, as it neither strengthens the point the politician is making or weakens the point the opposite politician is making.

Statistical treatment

In order to answer the research questions, both quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted. In order to determine if the number of metaphors used by Jesse Klaver (GreenLeft) and Mark Rutte (VVD) in the debate was significantly different, a Chi-square test was conducted. Furthermore, a context-based qualitative analysis was conducted to determine the nature (positive, negative, neutral) of the metaphors. After the nature of the metaphors was

determined, a second Chi-square test was conducted in order to determine if there was a significant difference in the use of positive, negative and neutral metaphors between Mark Rutte and Jesse Klaver. Ultimately, a qualitative analysis of the metaphors was conducted in order to find patterns which could be used to categorize the metaphors and furthermore to analyze what types of positive and negative metaphors were used.

Table 2.   Number of metaphors used by GreenLeft and the VVD in the final debate about
            immigration sorted by the nature of the metaphor, including the percentages
            compared to the total number of metaphors used by the political party (between
            brackets).

Results

Metaphor use by VVD and GreenLeft

A Chi-square test did not show a significant difference between the political party and

Table 1.   Number of metaphors used by GreenLeft and the VVD in the final debate about
            immigration, including the percentages compared to the total number of content
            words used by the political party (between brackets).

		Political party		
		GreenLeft	VVD	Total
Metaphor	Yes	94 (24%)	150 (29%)	244 (27%)
	No	294 (76%)	373 (71%)	667 (73%)
Total		388 (100%)	523 (100%)	911 (100%)

use of metaphors (χ^2 (1) = 2.26, p = .133). Mark Rutte of the VVD did not use significantly
more or less metaphors than Jesse Klaver of GreenLeft (28,7% vs. 24,2%). The total number
of content words, the number of metaphors and the percentages compared to the total number
of content words used by the political party (between brackets) are presented in Table 1.

Nature of metaphors used by VVD and GreenLeft

Furthermore, the use of positive and negative metaphors between both parties was
measured using a Chi-square test. A Chi-square test showed a significant difference between
the political party and the use of positive and negative metaphors (χ^2 (2) = 6.23, p = .044).
Significantly more positive metaphors were used by Mark Rutte (19,3%) than by Jesse Klaver
(9,6%). However, there were no significant differences in the use of negative and neutral
metaphors between Mark Rutte (VVD) and Jesse Klaver (GreenLeft). The total number of
metaphors (positive, negative, neutral) used by both party leaders and the percentages
compared to the total number of metaphors used by the party leaders (between brackets), are
presented in Table 2.

| | | Political party | | |
		GreenLeft	VVD	Total
Nature of the metaphor	Negative	20 (21%)	19 (13%)	39 (16%)
	Neutral	65 (69%)	102 (68%)	167 (68%)
	Positive	9 (10%)	29 (19%)	38 (16%)
Total		94 (100%)	150 (100%)	244 (100%)

Table 3.   Number of metaphors used by the VVD and GreenLeft in each of their turns during the debate and the nature of the used metaphors

Qualitative analysis

Types of positive and negative metaphors

Although significant differences were merely found in the use of positive metaphors, a qualitative analysis of the metaphors showed both similarities and differences in the use of positive, negative and neutral metaphors between both political parties. During the debate, both party leaders had a limited amount of time in which they could make their point regarding the subject of the debate, without the opponent interrupting them. Both party leaders took four turns in which they made their points or reacted to the points of the opponent. In the first turn, Mark Rutte was given the first opportunity to make his point about immigration. The results show that in the first turn, Mark Rutte only used positive and neutral metaphors. This pattern can be explained by the fact that he was the first politician to speak in the debate, therefore only stating his opinion about the subject as he couldn't react to the points of the opponent. In order to strengthen his opinion about the subject, a high number of positive metaphors were used, as well as neutral metaphors. In the second turn, Jesse Klaver was given the opportunity to react on the points Mark Rutte made in the first turn. The results show that he only used negative and neutral metaphors. This pattern can be explained due to the fact that he had to react to the points Mark Rutte made, and therefore tried to weaken them with negative metaphors. In the following turns, a pattern can be identified in which both party leaders used positive, negative and neutral metaphors. A possible explanation for these patterns is that both party leaders had to react to the point of the opponent, and tried to weaken them by using negative metaphors. Furthermore, the party leaders had to strengthen their own points, which explains the use of positive metaphors in these turns. The fact that Jesse Klaver used more negative metaphors than Mark Rutte can be explained by the fact that

			Nature of the metaphor			Total number
			Positive	Neutral	Negative	of metaphors
	Turn 1	VVD	7	19	0	26
		GreenLeft	0	6	5	11
	Turn 2	VVD	5	15	5	25
Turns in the		GreenLeft	4	22	6	32
debate	Turn 3	VVD	2	20	6	28
		GreenLeft	3	22	3	28
	Turn 4	VVD	12	19	9	40
		GreenLeft	2	11	2	15

he had to react to the points of his opponent in all four of his turns, while Mark Rutte only had to react to the points of his opponent in three of the four turns. Furthermore, the use of significantly more positive metaphors by Mark Rutte can be explained due to him being given the first turn, and therefore did not have to react to the points of his opponent in all four of his turns. The total number of metaphors (positive, negative, neutral) used by both party leaders per turn are presented in Table 3.

Metaphor categories

Similarities between the results of both studies can be seen with regard to the different categories of the metaphors used by the politician. Often, metaphors related to nature and the human body were identified in the debate of the current study, which are distinguished as two of six metaphor categories drawn by De Landtsheer et al. (2011). For instance, the great number of immigrants are often described as *'a stream of immigrants'* by Mark Rutte. Following the steps of the Metaphor Identification Procedure by the Pragglejaz Group (2007), the word 'stream' is identified as a metaphor:

A / **stream** / of / immigrants

(Mark Rutte (VVD) during the final debate with Jesse Klaver (GreenLeft))

Stream
a) Contextual meaning: a great number of immigrants moving towards the Netherlands.
b) Basic contemporary meaning: the propelling of an often liquid substance, e.g. rivers.

c) Contextual meaning vs. basic contemporary meaning: the two meanings of the word differ from each other, but can be compared to each other as they both describe a moving mass.

d) Metaphorical?
Yes

The basic meaning of this metaphor is the propelling of an often liquid substance such as in rivers and could therefore be categorized as a metaphor related to nature. Mark Rutte furthermore described Jesse Klaver as 'agile', which is metaphorical as well:

I / know / that / mister / Klaver / is / **agile** / , / but / we / have / now / reached / the / subject / of / climate / change / . /

(Mark Rutte (VVD) during the final debate with Jesse Klaver (GreenLeft))

Agile

a) Contextual meaning: skilled in changing the subject of debate, verbally maneuvering in a way to change the subject of debate

b) Basic contemporary meaning: physically flexible

c) Contextual meaning vs. basic contemporary meaning: the two meanings of the word differ from each other but can be compared with each other as they both describe the flexibility of Jesse Klaver. The basic contemporary meaning describes the literal flexibility, while the contextual meaning describes the verbal flexibility.

d) Metaphorical?
Yes

As the basic contemporary meaning of the word 'agile' is described as physically flexible, the metaphor is categorized as a metaphor related to the human body, and therefore has the greatest emotional potential according to De Landtsheer (2009).

Although similarities between De Landtsheer (2009) and the current study regarding the categorization of metaphors exists, fewer similarities were found between the current study and the study of Cammaerts (2012), which distinguished four metaphor categories. This study indicated that Belgian politicians used metaphors which were related to the following categories: *sports and games, war, transportation* and *culinary metaphors.* In the current study, very few identified metaphors could be placed in one of these four categories. Mark Rutte used a metaphor related to transportation ('to lift'), but in most cases the used metaphors were related to subjects other than the four categories drawn by Cammaerts (2012).

Instead, a greater number of metaphors used by Mark Rutte and Jesse Klaver were related to nature and physics. For instance, the metaphor 'cold' was used by Jesse Klaver in the sentence 'never again will we leave people standing in the cold' to describe that the Netherlands will never ignore people who need help, such as Syrian refugees. Moreover, Mark Rutte used the metaphor 'tensions' a total of six times to describe the current state of Dutch society with the arriving of foreign refugees. Despite the fact that a few metaphors can be categorized in one of the four categories by Cammaerts, most of the metaphors used by VVD and GreenLeft were not related to these categories.

A possible explanation for the differences in categories could be due to the fact that the four categories drawn by Cammaerts (2012) were closely related to the history and culture of Belgium and therefore mainly aimed at Belgian voters. World War I is one of the most important events in the history of Belgium, as several ferocious trench battles took place near the Belgium town of Ypres which are commemorated every year. As World War I plays an important role in Belgian society, Belgians are likely to relate better to metaphors related to war than to metaphors related to subjects which do not play such great role in the country's culture. Furthermore, the use of certain metaphors by politicians might be based on the listener's culture, as a similar category of metaphors related to Dutch history and culture could be distinguished in the current study. The Netherlands are internationally known for their knowledge and skills regarding the management of water, with examples such as the creation of the province Flevoland and the excessive use of dykes. In the debate, several metaphors were used which were related to water and the managing of water. For instance, Mark Rutte used the metaphor 'the locks are still open' to describe the great amounts of money which are invested in the development of third-world countries. Therefore, directly referring to the locks used in a variety of rivers flowing through the Netherlands.

Furthermore, the metaphor 'stream' was used several times by both Mark Rutte and Jesse Klaver to describe the great number of refugees moving from South- and Eastern-Europe to Western-Europe and the Netherlands. This metaphor for the great number of refugees is likely to be used to explain the abstract term of immigration by using terms related to Dutch culture, namely rivers and water management. Similarities can be found between the metaphors related to rivers and water management and the abstract term of immigration. Firstly, using the word 'stream' to describe the number of refugees coming to Western-Europe informs the listener that this is a situation that has to be dealt with. Similar to the rivers flowing through the Netherlands, the stream of immigrants will not stop by itself, but only by taking measures. In terms of water management, these measure include dams and

locks to regulate the stream, while in terms of immigration, these measures include regulations such as preventing refugees to cross certain borders. A third similarity between the terms water management and immigration can be the fact that a stream which is too powerful and great in size can cause flooding. In terms of immigration, too many refugees coming to the Netherlands might cause Dutch residents to be overwhelmed and unable to help the refugees. In conclusion, several metaphor categories drawn by earlier studies (De Landtsheer, 2009; Cammaerts, 2012) also apply to the metaphors used by VVD and GreenLeft in the current study. However, most of the metaphors are related to other subjects than the categories drawn by De Landtsheer (2009) and Cammaerts (2012). Moreover, a great number of metaphors were related to the history and culture of the Netherlands, namely their water management. Metaphors related to the history and culture of a county could therefore be a possible new metaphor category. However, further research have to be conducted in order to determine if this metaphor category exists.

Conclusion and discussion

This study has attempted to provide a greater insight into the use of metaphors by party leaders of liberal-right and socialist-left parties in a spoken debate about immigration in the Dutch elections of 2017. It was anticipated that Mark Rutte of the VVD would use more metaphors than Jesse Klaver of GreenLeft, due to the fact that the topic of the debate was immigration, which was considered a typical VVD point on which they had a strong opinion. However, the first hypothesis (H1) was rejected, as no significant differences were found in the use of metaphors between both party leaders.

Furthermore, it was anticipated that Mark Rutte would use significantly more positive metaphors (H2), as the subject of the debate was considered a typical VVD subject. This hypothesis was proven to be true, as a significant difference in the use of positive metaphors were found between both party leaders. Mark Rutte used significantly more positive metaphors than Jesse Klaver. However, no significant differences in the use of neutral and negative metaphors were found.

No specific hypotheses were formulated regarding the nature of the metaphors used by both politicians, as the identification of the nature of the metaphors was based on the context and attitudes towards the subject of both politicians could not be clearly determined. For instance, the attitude towards immigration of Mark Rutte was hard to determine, as he has been the Dutch cooperating with the leftist Labour Party (PvdA) to create an immigration policy since the previous elections. When more than one party is involved in creating policies and laws, certain political stances towards issues might be handed in, in order to receive support by the cooperating party on other subjects or issues. This means that certain regulation policies opposed by the VVD regarding immigration might have been neglected, and instead replaced with regulation policies made by the Labour Party in order for the VVD to form a policy on a different subject. Therefore, Mark Rutte's attitude towards the subject can be considered negative, as he thinks the current policy formed by the Labour Party is insufficient. Alternatively, his attitude towards the subject might be positive, as forming a new policy without the Labour Party gives the VVD the opportunity to change the previous policy. However, as immigration was considered a typical VVD subject of debate on which they had a strong opinion, it was expected that Mark Rutte would use more metaphors, and furthermore more positive metaphors than Jesse Klaver. The results showed that Mark Rutte used significantly more positive metaphors (a total of 29 positive metaphors) than Jesse Klaver (a total of 9 positive metaphors). However, no significant differences in the use of negative and neutral metaphors between both party leaders were found.

This study has attempted to provide a greater insight in the use of metaphors in a spoken debate between a socialist-left and a liberal-right party in the Dutch elections of 2017. Furthermore, it has attempted to provide a greater insight in the use of positive, negative and neutral metaphors, as well as an attempt to identify metaphor categories. A follow-up study could include an increased number of debates about different social issues, as well as more political parties (left, center, right) in order to draw more accurate conclusions regarding the use of metaphors. Furthermore, the materials in the current study were limited to a single spoken debate, which could raise the question if there are any differences in the use of metaphors by political parties in debates which have different subject. Moreover, it could raise the question if there are any differences in the use of metaphors between a spoken debate and a written political party program. Furthermore, a more reliable way of identifying positive, negative and neutral metaphors would be a necessity for coding the corpus in a consistent way. Identifying the nature of the metaphors was based on the context in which the metaphor occurred. However, it was unclear what the boundaries of the contexts were in which the metaphor had a positive, negative or neutral nature and meaning. For instance, the metaphor 'tensions' in the sentence 'Our policy resulted in a stronger society, despite the tensions caused by your party's policy' could be interpreted in multiple ways. As it weakens and attacks the point the opponent is making, namely that there are tensions caused by the policy of the opposing party, it could be coded as a negative metaphor. Alternatively, it strengthens the point that the politician is making, namely that despite the tensions in society caused by the opposing party, they have managed to build a stronger society. Therefore it could be coded as a positive metaphor. These difficulties in identifying the nature of a metaphor indicate that the nature of a metaphor is not only determined by the metaphor itself, but also by the way the context is framed. Certain words in a sentence, such as 'despite' could unconsciously form a frame from which the listener views the point that the politician is making. Further research is needed in order to prove that this hypothesis is correct.

Despite the fact that little results could be directly implemented in practice by carefully writing and preparing political debates, the current study provides a greater insight in the use of metaphors in Dutch politics. The study furthermore indicates that differences in the use of metaphors between political parties might be due to their different political beliefs, therefore opening the gates for further research within this subject.

References

Cammaerts, B. (2012). The strategic use of metaphors by political and media elites: the 2007-11 Belgian constitutional crisis. *International journal of media & cultural politics*, *8*(2/3), 229-249.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (2017). *Bevolking en bevolkingsontwikkeling; per maand, kwartaal en jaar.* Retrieved from http://statline.cbs.nl/statweb/publication/?vw=t&dm=slnl&pa=37943ned&d1=0-9&d2=203,220,237,254,271,288,(l-17)-l&hd=130605-0932&hdr=t&stb=g1

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

De Landtsheer, C. (2009). Collecting political meaning from the count of metaphor. In A. Musolff & J. Zinken (eds.), *Metaphor and Discourse* (pp. 59-78). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

De Landtsheer, C., Kalkhoven, L., & Broen, L. (2011). De beeldspraak van Geert Wilders, een tsunami over Nederland? *Tijdschrift voor Communicatiewetenschap*, *39*(4), 5-20.

Edelman, M. (1971). *Politics as symbolic action: Mass arousal and quiescence*. Chicago, U.S.: Markham.

GroenLinks. (n.d.). Geschiedenis. Retrieved from http://groenlinks.nl/partij/geschiedenis

Johnson, J.T., & Taylor, S.E. (1981). The effect of metaphor on political attitudes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 2*(4), 305-316.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, U.S.: Chicago University Press.

Landis, J.R., & Koch, G.G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33*(1), 159-174.

Links en rechts. (n.d.) Retrieved from https://www.parlement.com/id/vh8lnhrp8wsy/links_en_rechts

Michira, J. N. (2014). The language of politics: A CDA of the 2013 Kenyan presidential campaign discourse. *International Journal of Education and Research, 2*(1), 1-18.

Mudde, C. (2004). The populist zeitgeist. *Government and opposition, 39,* 542 – 563.

Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 22*(1), 1-39.

President Donald Trump inauguration speech [Blog post]. (2017, January 20). Retrieved from http://politiek.tpo.nl/column/2017-president-donald-trump-inauguration-speech/

Van den Bosch, A., Busser, G.J., Daelemans, W., and Canisius, S. (2007). An efficient memory-based morphosyntactic tagger and parser for Dutch. In F. van Eynde, P. Dirix, I. Schuurman, and V. Vandeghinste (Eds.), Selected Papers of the 17th Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands Meeting, Leuven, Belgium, pp. 99-114.

VVD. (n.d.). Onze geschiedenis. Retrieved from http://www.vvd.nl/onze-geschiedenis/

Wikipedia. (2017). Function words. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Function_word