

Do political metaphors really matter ?

Two experiments assessing the political impact of metaphors on citizens' opinions towards Belgian federalism

Jérémy Dodeigne¹², Julien Perrez¹ & Min Reuchamps²

¹*University of Liege (ULg)*

²*University of Louvain (UCLouvain)*

RaAM 2016, Berlin

Introduction

- Interdisciplinary project
 - Linguistics & political science
 - Metaphors in political discourse
 - Context: Belgian federalism
 - Use of metaphors
 - Different kinds of political corpora
 - Production and reception
 - Political impact of metaphors?

Belgian federalism?

Du. “Normale partijen die een staatshervorming willen enzovoort die willen eigenlijk hetzelfde als we zo zeggen een ernstige *LAT relatie* in dit land.” (PBN, M5, 3130-3131)’

c’est comme dans un *ménage*, on ne règle jamais les solutions une fois pour toutes. On se *marie, ou en vit ensemble*, peut importe, à 20 ans, puis on a des enfants, puis les enfants deviennent grands, puis le bonhomme fait sa crise de la quarantaine, puis on se dit que tout compte fait, on se dit que c’était quand même pas si mal et puis rien, et puis entre, temps, madame est ménopausée et puis... (...) puis..... Puis elle a perdu son job, puis les enfants se sont mariés, voilà que la maison est trop grande... les situations évoluent et je ne pense pas qu’on va rêver d’avoir une situation immuable. (PBF, B8, 1968-1977).



L2: “het is vergelijken met dat *huwelijk* he. De Belgische staat is een *gearrangeerd en geforceerd huwelijk* geweest.” (2263-2266) (...)


L6: “het is inderdaad een *gearrangeerd huwelijk* en het is *gearrangeerd* door de internationale gemeenschap” (2268-2269) (...)

L6 : “een *gearrangeerd huwelijk* kan ook ontbonden worden, zo moeilijk is dat allemaal niet. Het moet gewoon erkend worden door de internationale gemeenschap.” (2279-2280)

L2 : “ja maar dat *is getrouwd voor goede en kwade dagen* en wij zijn nu in *kwade dagen*.” (2281-2282)


L6 : “maar bij een *gearrangeerd huwelijk* is het niet *in goede en kwade dagen* vrijwillig, maar is het verplicht in *kwade dagen*. (...) ik hoop toch dat we zover zijn *dat huwelijken niet meer verplicht* zijn ofwel?” (2283-2287)

Fr. *On a coupé le citoyen du fonctionnement d'une espèce de mécanisme, de machine folle lancée sur elle-même.* (PBF, B8, 839-840)



Du. “Maar ik denk dat je kunt concluderen dat het federalisme zoals het nu is dat het niet *werkt*” (PBN, N4, 3318-3319)

La nouvelle répartition des compétences en Belgique



Le Tétris belge
De 1831 à 1970, la Belgique politique se résumait à l'État central, les provinces et les communes. Sauf les prérogatives attribuées aux pouvoirs locaux, l'État s'occupait de tout. En 1970, le Constituant a créé de nouvelles institutions: les Communautés et les Régions. Et chaque réforme de l'État a été l'occasion de prélever des compétences à l'État (appelé désormais État fédéral) pour les attribuer aux pouvoirs fédérés. C'est le grand Tétris belge, où l'on voit l'étagage du dessus qui se décompose peu à peu, morceau par morceau, au profit des autres pouvoirs. Dans certains cas, le législateur transfère des blocs homogènes (comme l'Enseignement, attribué aux Communautés en 1989). Dans d'autres, il ne transfère que des éléments d'une compétence (c'est le cas de la fiscalité: le Météo reste compétent mais accorde aux pouvoirs fédérés certaines prérogatives). Désormais, on distingue ainsi trois types de compétences. Celles exclusivement exercées par l'État (la Défense, par exemple). Celles exclusivement exercées par les Régions et les Communautés (Enseignement, Urbanisme, Travaux publics, etc.) Et celles où chaque pouvoir a une possibilité d'intervention. Dans le domaine de l'Emploi, par exemple, l'État est compétent dans certains domaines (régulation du chômage, par exemple) et les Régions sont compétentes pour d'autres (placement et formation des chômeurs). (7/26)

Research question

- What political impact(s) could this metaphor have on the people to which it is addressed.
- Crucial question in CL
 - CMT (Lakoff & Johnson 1980)
 - Metaphors have the ability of highlighting and hiding specific aspects of a target concept
- **Framing**
 - “[...] select[ing] some aspects of a perceived reality and mak[ing] it more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the described item” (Entman, 1993: 52)
 - “Metaphor helps construct particular aspects of reality and reproduce (or subvert) dominant schemas (Koller 2009: 121)

Do metaphors influence reasoning?

CRIME

Thibodeau & Boroditsky 2011, 2013



MORE SOCIAL INTEGRATION



MORE REPRESSION

CRIME

Thibodeau & Boroditsky 2011, 2013



MORE SOCIAL INTEGRATION

« even minimal metaphors can significantly shift people's representations and reasoning about important real-life domains »



MORE REPRESSION

Do metaphors influence reasoning?

- Thibodeau & Boroditsky 2011, 2013
 - Crime = virus => more social integration
 - Crime = beast => more repression
- Steen, Reijnierse & Burgers 2014; Reijnierse, Burgers, Krenmayr & Steen (2015)
 - Reading about crime increases people's overall preference for enforcement, regardless of the metaphorical frame
 - => Under which circumstances do metaphors influence reasoning?

XP design


- Central questions
 - Does the Tetris metaphor have an impact on the **representations** of Belgian federalism by the citizens?
 - Do these representations lead to different opinions about **regional autonomy**?

Tetris Metaphor

- 2 experiments (Online, limeSurvey protocol)
 - Experiment 1 (2013)
 - Linguistic analysis
 - Political scientific analysis
 - Experiment 2 (2014)
 - Linguistic analysis
 - Political scientific analysis

Experiment 1

Experimental material - Image



Experimental material - Text

Le Tetris belge

De 1831 à 1970, la Belgique politique se résumait à l'Etat central, les provinces et les communes. Sauf les prérogatives attribuées aux pouvoirs locaux, l'Etat s'occupait de tout. En 1970, le Constituant a créé de nouvelles institutions : les Communautés et les Régions. Et chaque réforme de l'Etat a été l'occasion de prélever des compétences à l'Etat (appelé désormais Etat fédéral) pour les attribuer aux pouvoirs fédérés. C'est le grand Tetris belge, où l'on voit l'étagage du dessus qui se décompose peu à peu, morceau par morceau, au profit des autres pouvoirs. Dans certains cas, le législateur transfère des blocs homogènes (comme l'Enseignement, attribué aux Communautés en 1989). Dans d'autres, il ne transfère que des éléments d'une compétence (c'est le cas de la fiscalité : le fédéral reste compétent mais accorde aux pouvoirs fédérés certaines prérogatives). Désormais, on distingue ainsi trois types de compétences. Celles exclusivement exercées par l'Etat (la Défense, par exemple). Celles exclusivement exercées par les Régions et les Communautés (Enseignement, Urbanisme, Travaux publics, etc.). Et celles où chaque pouvoir a une possibilité d'intervention. Dans le domaine de l'Emploi, par exemple, l'Etat est compétent dans certains domaines (législation sur le chômage, par exemple) et les Régions sont compétentes pour d'autres (placement et formation des chômeurs). *

The Belgian tetris

From 1831 to 1970, Belgium came down to the central state, the provinces and the municipalities. Except for the prerogatives devolved to the local authorities, the State took care of everything. In 1970, the constituent power created new institutions: communities and regions. And every state reform has been the occasion to take competences from the state (from there on called the federal state) to redistribute them to federal authorities. This is the big Belgian Tetris, where we see the upper floor that is falling apart (decomposing) , block by block, at the benefit of other authorities. In certain cases, the legislator is transferring homogeneous blocks (like education, handed over to the communities in 1989). In other cases, what is involved is just transferring some elements of a competence (it's the case of tax system: the federal state remains competent but assigned certain prerogatives to the federal entities). From now on, we therefore make a distinction between three types of competences. The ones that are exclusively exercised by the federal state (like Defense, for example). The ones that are exclusively exercised by the Regions and Communities (Education, Town planning, Public works, and so on). And the ones for which each power has some possibility of intervention. In the area of employment, for instance, the (federal) State is competent for certain domains (unemployment legislation, for instance) and the Regions are in charge of other ones (training courses of unemployed people).

The Belgian tetris

From 1831 to 1970, Belgium came down to the central state, the provinces and the municipalities. Except for the prerogatives devolved to the local authorities, the State took care of everything. In 1970, the constituent power created new institutions: communities and regions. And every state reform has been the occasion to take competences from the state (from there on called the federal state) to redistribute them to federal authorities. **This is the big Belgian Tetris, where we see the upper floor that is falling apart (decomposing), block by block, at the benefit of other authorities.** In certain cases, the legislator is transferring homogeneous **blocks** (like education, handed over to the communities in 1989). In other cases, what is involved is just transferring some elements of a competence (it's the case of the tax system: the federal state remains competent but assigned certain prerogatives to the federal entities). From now on, we therefore make a distinction between three types of competences. The ones that are exclusively exercised by the federal state (like Defense, for example). The ones that are exclusively exercised by the Regions and Communities (Education, Town planning, Public works, and so on). And the ones for which each power has some possibility of intervention. In the area of employment, for instance, the (federal) State is competent for certain domains (unemployment legislation, for instance) and the Regions are in charge of other ones (training courses of unemployed people).

4 XP Conditions

FULL
CONDITION

TEXT
CONDITION

IMAGE
CONDITION

CONTROL
CONDITION



INPUT

FREE DESCRIPTION TASK

Describe Belgian federalism in your own terms

IMAGE ASSOCIATION TASK

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS

Which political function can you fulfill without being directly elected?

ATTITUDE

“To what extent should Flemish people and Walloon people live together in the same country?

PERSONAL INFO

“Belgium is like a couple, a better communication will pacify the relations between Flemish and Walloon people

PRE-TEST



INPUT

FREE DESCRIPTION TASK

Describe Belgian federalism in your own terms

‘How important is politics to you?’

“To what extent do you think that federal entities should care for everything?”

“To what extent do you think that the federal government should care for everything? »

“To what extent do you consider yourself a Belgian citizen?”

“To what extent do you consider yourself a Walloon citizen?”

ATTITUDE

Hypotheses

H1. In the absence of metaphor, identitarian accounts would prevail in the participants' representations of Belgian federalism

H2A. In the absence of metaphor, participants are more unitarist

H2B. When exposed to the metaphor, participants are more regionalist.

Participants

- 1st y. French-speaking bachelor students
- Modern Languages + social and political sciences
- Pre-test: N = 493

	Pre-test		Post-test	
	N	%	N	%
Control condition	126	25.6	82	27.4
Full condition	125	25.4	79	26.4
Image condition	114	23.1	65	21.7
Text condition	128	26.0	73	24.4
Total	493	100.0	300	100.0

Participants

Table 1. Participants' profile across the experimental conditions

	N	%	PK (0-5)	PI (0-10)	Gender (% Men)	Belgian (0-10)	Walloon (0-10)
Control	131	25.8	2.85	5.96	49.2	8.15	6.44
Full	131	25.8	2.88	5.88	47.7	8.61	6.84
Picture	120	23.6	2.90	5.67	41.8	8.76	6.63
Text	126	24.8	2.83	5.64	44.4	8.51	6.34
Total	508	100.0	2.87	5.79	45.9	8.50	6.56
Chi ²	-	-	F _(0.127) =.078	F _(3.16) =.551	F _(0.138) =.554	F _(8.22) =1.51	F _(6.237) =0.458
test			p=.927	p=.648	p=.646	p=.328	p=.712

Key: PK= political knowledge, PI=political interest

XP1 - Results

- Analysis of the **description task**
 - Thematic domains

Table 2. Coding scheme for the free description task about representation of Belgian

federalism

Thematic domains	Content
Control	No text / plagiarism
History	Reference to the 1831 creation and/or early process of federalization in the 1970s
Institutions	Federal (but not federalism), unitary, central/national, substate, community, region, province/commune
Identity	Belgium, Flanders, Wallonia, Brussels, Wallonia-Brussels and Europe and all their related adjectives
Linguistic	Dutch-speaking, French-speaking and German-speaking
Organization (balance of power)	Distribution of competences/powers, autonomy, centripetal nature, centrifugal nature and the number of specific competences mentioned in the response.
Dynamics	Federalism is perceived positively, federalism is perceived negatively, complexity, conflicts, linguistic/cultural nature, community nature and territorial nature

XP1 - Results

Table 4. Percentage of the six thematic dimensions of participants' representations of Belgian federalism by group

	G1	G2	G3	G4	Chi-square tests
	(Control group)	(Picture +Text)	(Picture only)	(Text only)	
History	5,0%	12,8%	0,6%	25,8%	(57.82, df = 3)****
Institutional	56,1%	68,6%	48,5%	68,4%	(19.274, df = 3) ****
Identity	51,1%	32,1%	21,5%	25,2%	(34.99, df = 3) ****
Linguistic	7,2%	3,2%	4,3%	2,6%	(4.45, df = 3)
Organization	61,9%	66,0%	46,6%	65,8%	(16.866, df = 3) ****
Dynamic	40,3%	19,9%	22,7%	18,7%	(23.27, df = 3) ****

Sig. codes: ****p<.000

Hypotheses

H1. In the absence of metaphor, identitarian accounts would prevail in the participants' representations of Belgian federalism

XP1 - Results


- Attitude towards **regional autonomy**?

“To what extent do you think that federal entities should care for everything?”

“To what extent do you think that the federal government should care for everything? »

XP1 - Results

Figure 4. ANOVA of participants' preferences about regional autonomy



XP1 - Results

Table 5. Multivariate linear regression of participants' preferences about regional autonomy

	Beta	Std. error	Pr(> t)	
(Intercept)	6.105	0.474	0.000	****
Gender	0.258	0.199	0.196	
Belgian	0.082	0.043	0.054	*
Walloon	-0.093	0.031	0.003	***
Political knowledge	-0.143	0.083	0.085	*
Political interest	0.124	0.045	0.006	***
<i>Groups (Ref= control group)</i>				
G2 (text + picture)	-0.469	0.265	0.077	*
G3 (picture only)	-0.248	0.273	0.365	
G4 (text only)	-0.658	0.267	0.014	**
N=481 observations				
F-statistic: 3.894 on 8 and 462 DF (****)				
R ² = 0.063, Adjusted R ² =0.047				
Sig. codes: ****p<.000, ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05, *p<.10				

Hypotheses

H2A. In the absence of metaphor, participants are more unitarist

H2B. When exposed to the metaphor, participants are more regionalist.

XP1 – Main findings

- Subject who have been submitted to the textual stimulus tend to:
 - Highlight **different aspects** of Belgian federalism in their descriptions
 - System vs. identity
 - Express different preferences vis-à-vis regional autonomy

XP1 – Main findings

- BUT
 - Effect of the text >< effect of the metaphor
 - However, **reading the text** appears to have an **impact** on the representations of the participants, which might suggest an indirect impact of the metaphor.
 - Our xp design does not allow us to determine the specific role of the Tetris metaphor

Experiment 2

- 2 versions of the experimental text
 - Original version with the Tetris metaphor
 - Neutral version without the Tetris metaphor

The Belgian tetris

From 1831 to 1970, Belgium came down to the central state, the provinces and the municipalities. Except for the prerogatives devolved to the local authorities, the State took care of everything. In 1970, the constituent power created new institutions: communities and regions. And every state reform has been the occasion to take competences from the state (from there on called the federal state) to redistribute them to federal authorities. **This is the big Belgian Tetris, where we see the upper floor that is falling apart (decomposing), block by block, at the benefit of other authorities.** In certain cases, the legislator is transferring homogeneous **blocks** (like education, handed over to the communities in 1989). In other cases, what is involved is just transferring some elements of a competence (it's the case of the tax system: the federal state remains competent but assigned certain prerogatives to the federal entities). From now on, we therefore make a distinction between three types of competences. The ones that are exclusively exercised by the federal state (like Defense, for example). The ones that are exclusively exercised by the Regions and Communities (Education, Town planning, Public works, and so on). And the ones for which each power has some possibility of intervention. In the area of employment, for instance, the (federal) State is competent for certain domains (unemployment legislation, for instance) and the Regions are in charge of other ones (training courses of unemployed people).

The Belgian tetris federalism

From 1831 to 1970, Belgium came down to the central state, the provinces and the municipalities. Except for the prerogatives devolved to the local authorities, the State took care of everything. In 1970, the constituent power created new institutions: communities and regions. And every state reform has been the occasion to take competences from the state (from there on called the federal state) to redistribute them to federal authorities. ~~This is the big Belgian Tetris, where we see the upper floor that is falling apart (decomposing), block by block, at the benefit of other authorities.~~ In certain cases, the legislator is transferring homogeneous **blocks competences** (like education, handed over to the communities in 1989). In other cases, what is involved is just transferring some elements of a competence (it's the case of the tax system: the federal state remains competent but assigned certain prerogatives to the federal entities). From now on, we therefore make a distinction between three types of competences. The ones that are exclusively exercised by the federal state (like Defense, for example). The ones that are exclusively exercised by the Regions and Communities (Education, Town planning, Public works, and so on). And the ones for which each power has some possibility of intervention. In the area of employment, for instance, the (federal) State is competent for certain domains (unemployment legislation, for instance) and the Regions are in charge of other ones (training courses of unemployed people).

3 XP Conditions

TETRIS CONDITION

NEUTRAL
CONDITION

CONTROL CONDITION

The Bologna area

Between 1980 and 1990 Bologna was one of the most vibrant cities in Europe and the headquarters, in English, of the universities all started to open their doors. This was taking place at a moment when in Italy the university system produced over-inflations, corruption and a general loss of confidence in the institutions. Bologna was the only university in Italy that was not under the control of the National State and it was able to follow a different path. This is why Bologna is the only university in Europe that has managed to remain open, thanks to the efforts of a wide academic community, the vigorous transformation of the university and the support of the Italian government (MORI). In other words, it is only thanks to some elements of a combination of the use of existing Italian structures and the creation of new ones that Bologna has managed to survive. It was more an *ad hoc* solution made a little later than those types of comparisons. The third Euro-positively was because the Bologna process was not a top-down process, but was driven by the Region and community education. This opening up of the university system to the community has been a key element in the success of the Bologna process, in the domain of universities, the Bologna process is a response to concrete demands for university reform and a response to the needs of the community and the labour market, all interconnected.

The Enigmas within

From 1980 to 1990, Belgium's social divide has been the central theme of the program and the main catalyst. Designed for the non-ethnic elite, the program has been successful in that it has not only helped to bridge the divide, but also has helped to create a new, more unified society. The program has been successful in that it has not only helped to bridge the divide, but also has helped to create a new, more unified society. The program has been successful in that it has not only helped to bridge the divide, but also has helped to create a new, more unified society.

FREE DESCRIPTION TASK

IMAGE ASSOCIATION TASK

POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS

ATTITUDE

PERSONAL INFO

Participants

- 1st y. French-speaking bachelor students
- Modern Languages + social and political sciences
- N = 340

Participants / xp condition	
Control condition	110
Neutral condition	114
Tetris condition	116
Total	340

Participants

Table 2. Participants' profile across the experimental conditions

	N	%	PK (0-4)	PI (0-10)	Gender (% Men)	Belgian (0-10)	Walloon (0-10)
Control	110	32.5	2.19	5.71	47.4	9.45	7.41
Neutral	114	33.1	2.40	5.77	49.8	9.51	7.30
Tetris	116	34.5	2.41	5.58	46.4	9.80	7.29
Total	340	100	2.33	5.69	47.8	9.59	7.33
Chi ²	-	-	F ₍₂₎ =3.152	F ₍₂₎ =.399	F ₍₂₎ =.226	F ₍₂₎ =1.063	F ₍₂₎ =0.07
test			p=.04*	p=.671	p=.798	p=.346	p=.933

Key: PK= political knowledge, PI=political interest.

XP2 - Hypotheses

H1. In the absence of metaphor, identitarian accounts would prevail in the participants' representations of Belgian federalism

H2A. In the absence of metaphor, participants are more unitarist

H2B. When exposed to the metaphor, participants are more regionalist.

XP2 - Results

- Analysis of the **description task**
 - Thematic domains

Table 2. Coding scheme for the free description task about representation of Belgian

federalism

Thematic domains	Content
Control	No text / plagiarism
History	Reference to the 1831 creation and/or early process of federalization in the 1970s
Institutions	Federal (but not federalism), unitary, central/national, substate, community, region, province/commune
Identity	Belgium, Flanders, Wallonia, Brussels, Wallonia-Brussels and Europe and all their related adjectives
Linguistic	Dutch-speaking, French-speaking and German-speaking
Organization (balance of power)	Distribution of competences/powers, autonomy, centripetal nature, centrifugal nature and the number of specific competences mentioned in the response.
Dynamics	Federalism is perceived positively, federalism is perceived negatively, complexity, conflicts, linguistic/cultural nature, community nature and territorial nature

XP2 - Results

<i>Descriptive task</i>	<i>Control group</i>	<i>Neutral text</i>	<i>Tetris metaphor</i>	<i>Chi-square tests</i>
History	10,9%	31,6%	27,6%	(14,903, df=2)****
Institutional	82,7%	90,4%	93,1%	(6,526, df=2)**
Identity	64,5%	40,4%	44,0%	(15,199, df=2)****
Linguistic	14,5%	3,5%	0,9%	(20,348, df=2)**
Organizational	54,5%	80,7%	89,7%	(40,11, df=2)****
Dynamic	8,2%	3,5%	4,3%	(2,7781, df=2)

Hypotheses

H1. In the absence of metaphor, identitarian accounts would prevail in the participants' representations of Belgian federalism


// XP1

No differences between the neutral condition and the Tetris condition

XP2 - Results

- Attitude towards **regional autonomy**?

XP2 - Results



XP2 - Results

Determinants of participants' preferences about regional autonomy

	Beta
Gender	-0.240 (0.226)
Belgian identity	0.051 (0.050)
Walloon Identity	-0.025 (0.038)
Political knowledge	0.089 (0.124)
Political interest	0.068 (0.057)
Neutral conditions(ref=control)	0.270 (0.288)
Tetris conditions	-0.006 (0.290)
Constant	5.431 ^{***} (0.686)
Observations	340
R ²	0.020
Adjusted R ²	-0.0002
Residual Std. Error	2.151 (df = 332)

Hypotheses

H2A. In the absence of metaphor, participants are more unitarist

H2B. When exposed to the metaphor, participants are more regionalist.

>< XP1

No differences between the neutral condition and the Tetris condition

XP2 – Main findings

- Subject who have been submitted to the textual stimulus tend to:
 - Highlight different aspects of Belgian federalism
 - System vs. identity
 - // XP1
- No differences between the neutral and tetris conditions
 - Tetris metaphor does not lead the participants to produce different descriptions

Discussion

- **Framing?**

- Under what conditions can a given metaphor influence the perception of political issues?
 - ‘Raising questions about when metaphors do and do not influence reasoning’ (Steen et al 2014)
- Other parameters of metaphorical mappings
 - **Aptness?**
 - » « the degree to which a metaphor vehicle captures important features of a metaphor topic » (Thibodeau & Durgin 2011: 206)
 - **Extendness?**
 - » Support for a given metaphor?
 - **Frequency?**
 - » How often have been exposed to a given metaphor
 - **Deliberateness?**
 - » Has a metaphor been produced intentionally to achieve a particular goal in communication?

Further work

- Replicate experiment 2
 - Representative sample of citizens
 - Aptness
 - Extension to other metaphorical domains
 - Deliberateness
- Design a new experiment
 - Socio-economic issues
 - Universal basic income
 - Under analysis



**THANK YOU FOR
YOUR
ATTENTION**

Julien.Perrez@ulg.ac.be Min.Reuchamps@uclouvain.be



**THANK YOU FOR
YOUR
ATTENTION**

Julien.Perrez@ulg.ac.be Min.Reuchamps@uclouvain.be



MetaPol2016 : Metaphors and Political discourse

1-2 Dec 2016 Belgique (Belgium)

Login



MAIN MENU

Home

Registration

Program

Venue

Call for paper

Metaphors and Political Discourse [MetaPol 2016]

Metaphors and political discourse

MetaPol 2016

International conference

1-2 December 2016

University of Liège, Belgium

References

- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 43(4), 51–58.
- Reijnierse, W.G., Burgers, C., Krenmayr, T. & G. Steen (to appear). How viruses and beasts affect our opinions (or not): The role of extendedness in metaphorical framing. *Metaphor and the Social World*.
- Steen, G. J., Reijnierse, W. G., & Burgers, C. (2014). When do natural language metaphors influence reasoning? A follow-up study to Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2013). *PLoS ONE*, 9(12), e113536. doi: doi:10.1371/journal.pone. 0113536
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 6(2), e16782. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0016782
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2013). Natural language metaphors covertly influence reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 8(1), e52961. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0052961