

Comprehension of Metaphors by Typically Developing Arabic-Speaking Jordanian School Children

Ronza N. Abu Rumman

Department of English Language and Literature, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

Abstract—This paper reports on the findings of a study investigating the comprehension of Arabic metaphors by Jordanian school children. Thirty typically developing school children aged 6, 8 and 10 years old performed a metaphor verbal comprehension task based on 10 lexicalized metaphorical expressions incorporated into 10 short stories. Each short story ends with a target metaphorical expression and is followed by a question about identifying the referent of the metaphorical expression. The results show that old children were better at comprehending metaphors than young children. The study concludes that the comprehension of metaphor develops significantly with chronological age. Furthermore, the degree of the child's familiarity with given metaphors plays a crucial role in influencing the comprehension of metaphors.

Index Terms—Chronological age, comprehension, metaphor, metaphorical expressions, school children

I. INTRODUCTION

The domain of this paper is figurative language comprehension in typically developing school children. In particular, it aims at exploring how Jordanian school children who belong to different age groups (6, 8 and 10 years old) interact with Arabic metaphorical expressions on the receptive level.

In figurative language, the intended meaning of words, expressions and sentences differ from their literal meaning (Glucksberg, 2001). Accordingly, the comprehension of figurative language requires identifying the speaker's intention in a given context (Rapp & Wild, 2011). Figurative language can take multiple forms, such as metaphor, simile, idioms, personification, hyperbole, etc. Figurative language is used frequently in speech and writing since people use approximately six nonliteral expressions per minute (Glucksberg, 1989). However, not all figurative expressions are equally pervasive in spoken and written discourse. This may explain why some figurative forms, such as metaphor, simile, idioms have received more attention in literature than other figures of speech (Cacciari & Padovani, 2012, p. 505).

Metaphor is "pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 3). Thus, understanding metaphorical expressions plays a crucial role in measuring the success of communication in relation to adults in general and children in particular. This may explain the growing research interest in investigating metaphor comprehension and production by children (Winner et al., 1976; Reynolds & Ortony, 1980; Abulhaija, 1988; Gentner, 1988; Perason, 1989; Seitz, 1997; Al-Qassas, 2006; Bosco et al., 2009; Rundblad & Annaz, 2010; Rocha et al., 2020).

Winner et al. (1976) assessed the effect of domain on the comprehension of metaphor for children aged 10, 12 and 14 years old. The researchers incorporated the psychological-physical metaphors and cross-sensory metaphors. The results indicated that the ability to comprehend metaphors develop through age since the performance of 14-year-old children was better. In addition, the performance of ten-year-old children on cross-sensory metaphors was much better than psychological-physical metaphors.

Reynolds and Ortony (1980) investigated the ability of elementary school children ranging in age from 7 to 12 years to comprehend metaphorical expressions by asking them to read several short stories and to choose the target sentence that it best completed the story out of a number of sentences which were metaphorically and literally related to the story. The researchers revealed that children faced more difficulty in comprehending metaphor than simile. In addition, metaphoric competence is established until around the age of nine years old and a half, whereas the competence in understanding simile develops as early as seven years old and a half.

Abulhaija (1988) examined the comprehension of metaphor by children aged from 3 to 9 years old. Children were asked to choose the picture that matches the target figurative expression. The researcher also elicited data from children's spontaneous speech. The researcher concluded that the ability of children to use figurative language emerges early at the age of 3 years old and it develops further when they grow up.

Perason (1989) explored the comprehension of metaphors by fifty two preschool children aged from (3;0- 5;2) through a repetition task in which their performance on repeating metaphors was compared to their performance on repeating sentences that are semantically well formed and other ones which are semantically anomalous. The study concluded that "metaphor was not semantically anomalous to the children and that they were processed on a par with

literal language". Furthermore, the results showed that "metaphor emerges early in the child's linguistic repertoire" (p. 185).

Seitz (1997) examined the ability of 40 children (4 years old) and 40 children (6 years old) to use and comprehend six kinds of metaphorical relations "color, shape, physiognomic, cross-modal, psychological-physical, and taxonomic matches" by developing a comprehension task conducting in words and pictures. The findings indicated that young children showed the crucial role of pictures in understanding perceptual metaphors, whereas old children showed the significant effect of words on comprehending conceptual metaphors.

Al-Qassas (2006) explored the ability of Jordanian children to produce and comprehend figurative comparisons. Regarding the comprehension task, the participants were asked to select the picture that best matches the figurative comparisons. Regarding the production task, the children were asked to answer questions (N=21) presented with pictures and related to their domains in order to produce figurative expressions. The researcher concluded that age plays a significant role in the ability of children to produce figurative expressions. Furthermore, children's ability to comprehend figurative comparisons precedes their ability to produce them.

Bosco et al. (2009) investigated the comprehension of the communicative meaning of a number of figurative expressions for 108 children aged (7 to 10; 6 years old) by asking them to listen to audio-recorded stories including a figurative expression. The findings revealed that sincere figurative expressions were easier to be comprehended by children than deceitful ones which are in turn easier than ironic figurative expressions to be understood. Moreover, the researchers concluded that the complexity of the mental representations justifies the difference of difficulty that children experience in understanding the communicative meaning of the figurative expressions as well as the non-figurative expressions.

Rundblad and Annaz (2010) examined the comprehension of metaphor and metonymy for forty five typically developing individuals ranging in age from (5; 3- to 37; 1 years old) through a verbal comprehension task based on twenty short picture stories. The study concluded that "the development of metaphor and metonymy comprehension is strongly linked with chronological and MA [mind age], but metaphor comprehension develops at a slower rate compared to metonymy" (p. 547).

Rocha et al. (2020) assessed the comprehension of metaphors by Portuguese typically developing school children. The researchers examined the influence of the following factors, namely, gender, number of siblings, parents' educational levels, and family history of language disorders on metaphor comprehension. The study found that no gender significant differences were found regarding metaphor comprehension, whereas the number of siblings positively correlated with metaphor comprehension. In addition, children whose parents have a family history of speech or language disorder performed worse than their peers. Finally, children whose parents have a higher educational level performed better than their peers.

As is clear, the review of related studies indicated that age plays a vital role in the ability of children to produce and comprehend figurative language. In addition, the ability of children to comprehend figurative expressions develops earlier than their ability to produce them. The current study makes a contribution to the body of already exiting literature on school children's acquisition of figurative language in general and of metaphor comprehension in particular. The current study is meant to fill a gap in the literature as the previous developmental research has examined the comprehension of metaphors in native speakers of English (Winner et al., 1976; Reynolds & Ortony, 1980; Gentner, 1988; Perason, 1989; Seitz, 1997; Bosco et al., 2009; Rundblad & Annaz, 2010; Rocha et al., 2020). To the best of the researcher's knowledge, there are just two studies that tackled the acquisition of metaphors by Arabic-speaking children (Abulhaija, 1988; Alqassas, 2006, etc.). Accordingly, the current study is the first study that examines the comprehension of Arabic metaphors by Jordanian-Arabic speaking children by the use of short stories; hence, it may provide additional evidence for the typical developmental pattern of metaphor comprehension in children, regardless of their native language.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides a brief account of metaphor, whereas section 3 specifies the study objectives and significance. Methodology is described in section 4. Results are presented in section 5. Discussion is presented in section 6, and conclusion and recommendations are provided in section 7.

II. METAPHOR: A BRIEF ACCOUNT

The concept of metaphor is defined in Online Merriam-Webster dictionary as "a figure of speech in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them". Defining metaphor as a figure of speech represents the traditional view which refers back to Aristotle who confines the use of metaphors to the literature in which metaphor is of great aesthetic value both in poetry and in prose. In this view, metaphor is considered "a kind of decorative addition to ordinary language" and regarded as something that is located outside normal language, and thus it needs a special type of explanation (Finch, 2000, p. 170).

Richards (1963) posits that metaphor is an interaction between "thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase" (p. 93). He also introduces two technical terms: "the tenor" and "the vehicle" to talk about metaphor. For example in the following metaphor "men are wolves", the word "men" is called the tenor, the word "wolves" is called the vehicle. In other words, the tenor (men) is understood metaphorically in terms of the

vehicle (wolves). Later, Richards introduces another technical term which is called “ground” to refer to a set of characteristics shared between the tenor and the vehicle (ibid: 96).

On the other hand, Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) which was originally proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) viewed metaphor in a way that is distinctly different from the way in which traditional approaches represent metaphor. Thus, instead of considering metaphor a stylistic and artistic ornament to the literal language, metaphor is perceived as something essential to human thought and reasoning (p. 3). Put another way, the main tenet of this theory is that “metaphors are conceptual in nature, that is, that they reside in the conceptual system, and not just in language” (Kövecses, 2005, p. 9).

Metaphors rely on embodied human experiences (e.g., Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Grady, 1997a, 1997b). Since human beings grasp abstract notions through their bodies and physical experience, embodied experience is expressed metaphorically (Kövecses, 2005, p. 2). For example, affection is perceived metaphorically as warmth because of the association that is established between the passionate embrace of our parents and the bodily warmth that we felt when we were hugged by them since childhood. This creates the conceptual metaphor AFFECTION IS WARMTH. Thus, thinking and talking about “affection in terms of warmth arises naturally from our embodied experience”. For instance, we describe the relationship that we have with someone as warm e.g., “We have a warm relationship” (ibid: 3).

In the same vein, Kövecses (2010) stated that metaphor in the cognitive linguistic view is defined as “understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain” (p. 4). In particular, Kövecses (2010) argued that conceptual metaphor consists of two conceptual domains: Source and target domain. The conceptual domain which is used to understand another conceptual domain is called the source domain, while the conceptual domain which is understood in this way is called the target domain. For instance, in the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY the source domain which tends to be more concrete is JOURNEY which is used to understand the target domain which tends to be more abstract LIFE (p. 4).

III. OBJECTIVES

This study investigates the extent to which Jordanian typically developing School children aged 6, 8, and 10 years old comprehend Jordanian Spoken Arabic (JSA) metaphors. It also examines the influence of school children’s familiarity with metaphor on metaphor comprehension. The study aims to find answers to the following research questions:

- (1) Does understanding of metaphor develop in relation to chronological age in typically developing school children?
- (2) Does the degree of familiarity with metaphor affect the comprehension of metaphor in typically developing school children?

IV. METHOD

A. Participants

Thirty (18 males, 12 females) Jordanian Arabic-speaking children from 3 age groups (6, 8, and 10 years old) participated in this experiment. All children were monolingual and had Arabic as their first language. All participants were sampled from a public school in Amman, the capital of Jordan. All participants belonged to middle-class families, had normal hearing and vision abilities and had no language learning impairments.

B. Material and Procedures

A comprehension task was developed to assess the ability of Jordanian school children to comprehend metaphorical expressions. Ten lexicalized metaphors were selected based on consultation with the participants’ teachers who evaluated the metaphorical expressions in relation to their familiarity and age of acquisition. The ten lexicalized metaphors were incorporated into the end of ten short stories (see appendix) representing everyday situations. Each short story was followed by an open ended question, such as *Who did the character/ characters see?*

During one session, children were tested orally and individually in a quiet room at their school. Each story was read by the researcher and was followed by a question to evaluate the comprehension of lexicalized metaphors. All participants took between 10 to 15 minutes to finish the task. Communication between the researcher and the children in all tasks was in Jordanian Spoken Arabic (JSA) and all sessions were audio-recorded by the researcher. All children’s responses were classified as either figurative or literal interpretations of the target word.

C. Scoring

Quantitatively, responses were categorized based on the participants’ interpretation of the target metaphors as literal or figurative interpretations. Figurative interpretations of target metaphors were given one point, whereas literal interpretations were given zero.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. The Overall Frequency and Percentage of Literal and Figurative Interpretations of All Target Metaphors

Table 1 presents the complete list of the frequencies and the percentages of both literal and figurative interpretations of target metaphors identified in the whole comprehension task for each age group. The general findings show that the 10- year- old children's performance on the comprehension task was better than the performance of children belonging to other age groups, i.e. 6-year-old children and 8- year-old children.

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE INTERPRETATIONS OF ALL TARGET METAPHORS IDENTIFIED IN THE WHOLE COMPREHENSION TASK

Age Group	The frequency and percentage of literal interpretations		The frequency and percentage of figurative interpretations	
Six years old	59	55%	41	41%
Eight years old	36	36%	64	64%
Ten years old	0	0%	100	100%

Table 1 shows that the percentage of correct responses (the figurative interpretations) of target metaphors for children of 10 years old was the highest, accounting for 100%. This means that children at this age were able to comprehend the target lexicalized metaphors completely, whereas the percentage of figurative interpretations of lexicalized metaphors provided by children aged 8 years old was 64%. This emphasizes that children at the age of 8 have not mastered the acquisition of metaphorical expressions completely compared with children aged 10 years old. On the other hand, the performance of six-year-olds was the poorest compared with other age groups, accounting for 41%. The results revealed that six-year-olds depend heavily on the literal interpretations of the metaphorical expressions, accounting for 55%. The results show that the frequencies and percentages of correct responses increase steadily with age. Thus, the ability of children to comprehend metaphors increases significantly with chronological age.

B. The Overall Frequency and Percentage of Literal and Figurative Interpretations of Each Target Metaphor Based on the Age Group

The following section shows the frequency and percentage of literal and figurative interpretations of each target metaphor based on each age group.

C. The Overall Frequency and Percentage of Literal and Figurative Interpretations of Each Target Metaphor for Six-Year-Old Children

TABLE 2
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE INTERPRETATIONS OF EACH TARGET METAPHOR FOR SIX-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN

Item No. Target metaphor	Degree of Familiarity	Frequency and percentage of literal interpretations		Examples of the literal interpretations	Frequency and percentage of figurative interpretations		Examples of the figurative interpretations
1-(The moon)	Familiar	3	30%	The moon	7	70%	Laila
2-(The honey)	Familiar	4	40%	Honey	6	60%	Sarah, the baby, the girl, his sister
3-(The cow)	Familiar	3	30%	The cow, the animal,	7	70%	The boy, the fat boy
4-(The plane)	Familiar	5	50%	the plane	5	50%	Saeed, The fast boy
5-(The oven)	Familiar	5	50%	The oven	5	50%	The warm room
6-(The lion)	Unfamiliar	9	90%	The lion, the animal, the tiger, the predacious animal	1	10%	Saeed
7-(The angel)	Unfamiliar	9	90%	The angel, The king	1	10%	Ali, the kind person
8-(The stones)	Unfamiliar	7	70%	Stones, rocks	3	30%	The bag, the books
9- (The fox)	Unfamiliar	9	90%	The fox, the animal, the doll	1	10%	Saeed
10-(The prison)	Unfamiliar	9	90%	The prison	1	10%	The room, the house
Total		59			41		

The results demonstrated that six-year-old children's performance was not satisfactory compared with other age groups. Put another way, the youngest children aged six years old were found to be the most literal in their interpretation of metaphors as indicated by their overall performance across the task. Despite their poor performance, six-year-old children showed an early stage of metaphor comprehension especially when these metaphors are frequently heard and used in their daily life. For instance, six-year-old children were able to provide the metaphorical interpretations of the expression "*the cow*" which is used metaphorically to refer to a fat person, accounting for 70%. 70 % of children aged six years old were also able to identify the metaphorical usage of the word "*the moon*" which is used to refer to a beautiful girl, whereas 60 % of children aged six years old were able to identify the metaphorical meaning of the word "*the honey*" which is used to refer to a lovely girl. The main findings revealed that children's familiarity with the metaphorical expression plays a significant role in their ability to identify its metaphorical usage in a given context. On the other hand, only 10% of children aged six years were able to figure out the metaphorical meaning of the words, *the fox, the lion, the angel, the prison* which are used to refer metaphorically to, Saeed, Saeed,

Ali, one's room or house, respectively. It seems that the vast majority of children aged 6 years old failed to recognize the metaphorical meaning of the previously mentioned words, namely, *the fox*, *the lion*, *the angel*, *the prison* which are used metaphorically to refer to a cunning person, a brave person, a kind person, and one's room or house, respectively. It seems quite obvious that children aged 6 years failed to identify the metaphorical meaning of these words because they are not commonly used in their daily life.

D. The Overall Frequency and Percentage of Literal and Figurative Interpretations of Each Target Metaphor for Eight-Year-Old Children

TABLE 3
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE INTERPRETATIONS OF EACH TARGET METAPHOR FOR EIGHT-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN

Item No. Target metaphor	Degree of Familiarity	Frequency and percentage of literal interpretations		Examples of the literal interpretations	Frequency and percentage of figurative interpretations		Examples of the figurative interpretations
1- (The moon)	Familiar	2	20%	The moon	8	80%	Laila
2- (The honey)	Familiar	0	0%	The honey	10	100%	Sarah, the baby, his sister, the girl
3- (The cow)	Familiar	0	0%	The cow	10	100%	The boy, Samir,
4- (The plane)	Familiar	1	10%	The plane	9	90%	Saeed, the fast boy
5- (The oven)	Familiar	2	20%	The oven	8	80%	The warm room
6- (The lion)	Unfamiliar	9	90%	The lion	1	10%	Saeed,
7- (The angel)	Unfamiliar	6	60%	The angel	4	40%	Ali
8- (The stones)	Unfamiliar	6	60%	The stones	4	40%	The bag, the books
9- (The fox)	Unfamiliar	9	90%	The fox	1	10%	Saeed
10- (The prison)	Unfamiliar	6	60%	The prison	4	40%	The house, the room
Total		36			64		

The results revealed that eight-year-old children's performance was better than the performance of six-year-olds. The high frequency of correct responses (the figurative interpretation) for certain items might be attributed to the fact that children are more exposed to certain metaphorical expressions than others in their daily life, such as "*the honey*" is used to refer to a lovely girl, accounting for 100%, "*the cow*" used to refer to a fat person, accounting for 100% and "*the plane*" used to refer to a fast person, accounting for 90%. 80% of children aged 8 years were able to figure out the metaphorical meaning of the word "*the oven*" which is used metaphorically to mean a warm place or room. On the other hand, 90 % of children aged 8 years failed to figure out the metaphorical meaning of the word "*the fox*" and "*the lion*" which are used metaphorically to mean a cunning person and a brave person, respectively. 60% failed to figure out the metaphorical meaning of the word "*the prison*" which is used metaphorically to mean one's room or house. 60% failed to figure out the metaphorical meaning of the expression "the stones" which is used metaphorically to mean the heavy things, such as a heavy bag or heavy books. The findings demonstrated that the familiarity of the metaphorical expression is considered an important factor that influences the ability of children to comprehend metaphors.

E. The Overall Frequency and Percentage of Literal and Figurative Interpretations of Each Target Metaphor for Ten-Year-Old Children

TABLE 4
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE INTERPRETATIONS OF EACH TARGET METAPHOR FOR TEN-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN

Item No. Target metaphor	Degree of Familiarity	Frequency and percentage of literal interpretations		Examples of the literal interpretations	Frequency and percentage of figurative interpretations		Examples of the figurative interpretations
1- (The moon)	Familiar	0	0	The moon	10	100	Laila
2- (The honey)	Familiar	0	0	The honey	10	100	Sarah, the baby, his sister, the girl
3- (The cow)	Familiar	0	0	The cow	10	100	The boy, Samir,
4- (The plane)	Familiar	0	0	The plane	10	100	Saeed, the fast boy
5- (The oven)	Familiar	0	0	The oven	10	100	The heater
6- (The lion)	Unfamiliar	0	0	The lion	10	100	Saeed,
7- (The angel)	Unfamiliar	0	0	The angel	10	100	Ali
8- (The stones)	Unfamiliar	0	0	The stones	10	100	The bag, the books
9- (The fox)	Unfamiliar	0	0	The fox	10	100	Saeed
10- (The prison)	Unfamiliar	0	0	The prison	10	100	The house, the room
Total		0			100		

The findings indicated that the performance of 10-year-old children was the best among all age groups. The eldest age group was the most metaphorical in their interpretations of the metaphorical expressions since all participants answered the questions of the comprehension task correctly. This might be attributed to the fact that they are the oldest participants. This might have been an indication that children at the age of 10 years have almost acquired the ability to comprehend metaphors.

VI. DISCUSSION

Children's performance on metaphor verbal comprehension task incorporating 10 short stories showed a developmental change on metaphor comprehensions with chronological age. The performance of older children was better than other younger participants since 100% of the children aged 10 years were able to figure out the figurative interpretations of the target metaphors fully and easily compared with other age groups. The performance of the youngest children who are aged 6 years was not satisfactory as it was mainly based on the literal interpretation of the metaphorical expressions. For instance, 55% of children aged 6 years failed to show metaphor comprehension. This lends support to Winner et al. (1980) who stated that children younger than seven were not able to rephrase or correctly select the meaning of a metaphorical statement that involved an implicit comparison.

The main results have revealed that the ability of children to comprehend metaphors improves gradually with age. For example, whereas only 41 % of children aged 6 years were able to comprehend metaphors, and 64% of children aged 8 years were able to comprehend metaphors, 100 % of children aged 10 years were able to comprehend metaphor. The results of the current study are in line with the findings of previous research studies (Winner et al., 1976; Gentner, 1988; Winer et al., 2001) which revealed that the comprehension of metaphors steadily develops through age. In the same vein, Gentner (1988) stated that the ability to comprehend metaphors improves throughout the school years.

Furthermore, the current study found that the degree of familiarity of metaphors plays a vital role in facilitating the comprehension of metaphorical expressions. Put another way, children show better comprehension of metaphors as long as they are used widely in their daily life and they are already familiar with it. For instance, the majority of students were able to comprehend the following metaphorical expressions, namely, *the honey*, *the moon*, *the oven* which are used to refer to a lovely girl, a beautiful girl, and a warm room, respectively. On the other hand, the majority failed to comprehend the following metaphorical expressions which are not commonly used in their daily life contexts, and thus they are not familiar with, namely the fox, the lion, the prison and the stones which are used metaphorically to refer to a cunning person and a brave person, one's room or house, and heavy things, respectively.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The current study aimed at exploring the comprehension of Arabic metaphors by Jordanian school children aged 6, 8 and 10 years old. Children's performance on metaphor comprehension was tested by a verbal comprehension task incorporating 10 short stories. The main finding showed a developmental change on metaphor comprehensions with chronological age. The results revealed that the degree of familiarity of metaphors plays a vital role in facilitating the comprehension of metaphorical expressions since children showed a better understanding of metaphors which they are more familiar with in their daily life contexts.

Examining the effect of task type on metaphor comprehension may furnish ground for further future research to include different task types. In this regard, a number of variables should be taken into account in relation to picture-matching tasks, such as the number of provided pictures and to what extent they facilitate metaphor comprehension. Furthermore, future research may examine the production of metaphors by both Jordanian school and pre-school children. Future research may also investigate the acquisition of other types of figures of speech, such as metonymy, irony, personification, and idioms in school children.

APPENDIX

(1). An example of a metaphor story: (The moon: a beautiful girl).

انعزمت ليلي على حفلة عيد ميلاد صاحبها سلمى. الحفلة رح تبدأ الساعة تسعة المساء.
فراحت ليلي على السوق و اشترت فستان جديد و راحت على الصالون و عملت تسريحة لشعرها حلوة كثير.
لما وصلت ليلي بيت صاحبها المسارنت الجرس.
ففتحت صاحبها سلمى الباب و قالت لصاحبها الثانيات : تعوا شوفوا القمر .
فركض البنات على الباب .
ايش شافن البنات؟

Laila was invited to her friend's birthday "Salma". The party will start at nine in the evening. Laila went to the market, bought a new dress, went to the salon and did a very sweet hairstyle for her hair. When Laila reached her friend's house, the bell rang.

So her friend Salma opened the door and said to her other companions: Come see the moon. The girls ran to the door.

What do the girls see?

(2). An example of a metaphor story: (A Fox : a cunning person).

سعيد و محمد أصحاب وبيتهم قريب من حديقة الحيوانات. أخذ سعيد من محمد خمس دنانير و حكاكه بكره بشريلك لعبة جديدة . و في اليوم الثاني شاف سعيد محمد فقوله الخمس دنانير ضاعوا مني فعرف محمد انه سعيد كذب عليه. و في اليوم الثاني راح محمد على المدرسة و حكى لأصحابه شوفوا هي الثعلب بمشي في الساحة.

ايش شاف محمد و اصحابه في الساحة؟

Saeed and Mohamed are friends and their houses are close to the zoo. Saeed took five dinars from Muhammad and said to him I would buy a new game for you the day after. On the following day, Saeed saw Muhammad r, and he told him the five dinars had lost from me, so Muhammad knew that Saeed had lied to him. And on the following day, Muhammad went to school and told his friends "see the fox is walking in the yard".

What did Muhammad and his friends see in the yard?

(3). An example of a metaphor story: (A lion : a brave person).

كان سعيد شجاع كثير و يحب صاحبه و بدافع عنهم و كان يحب يحضر افلام عن الحيوانات المفترسة زي الاسود و النمر. و في يوم من الايام ساعد سعيد ولد صغير و قع في الحفرة. و في اليوم الثاني من مساعدته للولد وصل سعيد على المدرسة فسمع الاولاد يحكوا تعوا شوفوا الاسد ؟ ايش شافوا الاولاد؟

Saeed was very brave and loves his companions and defended them, and he likes to watch films about predatory animals such as lions and tigers. And one day Saeed helped a little boy who had fallen in a hole. And on the following day, Saeed arrived at the school, and he heard the children saying, "Do you see the lion"?

What did the children see?

(4). An example of a metaphor story: (An Oven : a warm room).

كان سمير و احمد يلعبوا كرة قدم في الملعب في فصل الشتاء كانوا فرحانين كثير بس بنفس الوقت بردانين و لما غربت الشمس رجعوا على البيت و دخلوا على غرفتهم النوم كانت امهم مشغلة التدفئة فيها من الصبح فحكوا يا سلام هاي فرن. ايش الفرن الي بيحكوا عنه سمير و احمد؟

Samir and Ahmed were playing football in the stadium in winter. They were very happy, but at the same time cold, and when the sun set, they returned home and entered their bedroom, their mother was heating it since morning, so they said, "Oh, my God, this is an oven".

What is the oven that Samir and Ahmed are talking about?

(5). An example of a metaphor story: (An Angel : a kind person).

كان علي شخص منيح و طيب و يحب كل الناس و يساعد المحتاجين و كل الصغار كانوا يحبوا لانه يحكيهم قصص و حكايا خيالية و بيوم من الايام زار علي بيت جارهم لؤي لانه وعد اولاد لؤي انه يحكيهم قصة الامير النائم و لما فتح لؤي الباب لحتي يفتح لعلي الباب حكي لاولاده تعوا شوفوا الملاك ؟ ايش شافوا الاولاد؟

Ali was a good and kind person and loved all people and helped the needy. All children loved him because he told them stories and fairy tales. One day, Ali visited their neighbor (Loay) because he promised Loay's children that he would tell them the story of the sleeping prince, and when Loay opened the door to open for him, he told his children, come and see the angel?

What did the children see?

(6). An example of a metaphor story: (Stones : heavy things).

ماجد طالب في مدرسه المدينة الجديدة و بروح على المدرسة مشي لانها قريبة من بيته بس بكره يوم الاحد لانه عليه سبع حصص يعني بدوا يحمل في الشنته سبع كتب ثقلا فلما حمل الشنته نزلها على الارض و حكي هاي حجار؟ ايش الحجار الي يحكي عنها ماجد؟

Majed is a student in the new city school and he goes to the school on foot because it is close to his house. Tomorrow, he will carry seven heavy books in the bag because he has seven classes. When he carried the bag, he threw it on the ground and said "they are stones" What are the stones that Majid is talking about?

(7). An example of a metaphor story: (Honey : a lovely girl).

كانت ام احمد في المستشفى لانها جابت طفلة جديدة اسمها سارة. اول ما وصلت البيت و اجى احمد من المدرسة حكتله تعال يا ماما شوف العسل الي جبته؟ ايش شاف احمد؟

Umm Ahmed was in the hospital because she had a new baby called Sarah. As soon as she got home and Ahmed came from school, she told him, "come on, Mama, see the honey that I brought?"

What did Ahmad see ?

(8). An example of a metaphor story: (A cow : a fat person).

كان سامر ولد ناصح كثير و يحب يلعب لعبة شد الحبل و كان ابوه برربي حيوانات بجنب البيت و بيوم من الايام نادى صاحبه عشان يلعبوا معه فلما اجوا صاحبه و بلشوا يلعبوا صاروا يحكوا البقرة مش قادرة تشد الحبل؟ مين البقرة؟

Sameer was a very fat boy and he loved to play the tug-of-war game a lot. His father kept animals near the house, and one day he called his friends to play with him, so when his friends came and started playing the tug-of-war game, they said the cow can't you pull the rope? Who is the cow?

(9). An example of a metaphor story: (A rocket : a fast person).

كان سعيد اسرع طالب في الصف ففاز في سباق الجري و حصل على الميدالية الذهبية و في نفس الوقت كان يحب يلعب بالطيارات و باي لعبه بطير بالهوا و في اليوم الثاني لما اجوا صاحبه على المدرسة و شافوه حكوا شفتنا الطيارة بتلعب في الساحه. ايش شافوا الأولاد

Saeed was the fastest student in the class. He won the running race and won the gold medal. At the same time, he liked to play with airplanes, and he used to play with birds in the air. On the second day, when his friends came to the school and saw him, they said we saw the plane playing in the yard.

What did the boys see?

(10). An example of a metaphor story: (A prison : room).

نبيل يحب يلعب برة و ما يحب يدخل على البيت و كان يضل يعمل مشاكل مع اولاد الجيران و يضربهم و الكل كان يشكي منه فلما نادته امه وقت الغروب لينام في غرفته قلها مش داخل على السجن. وين بده يدخل نبيل؟

Nabil likes to play outside, and he doesn't like to enter the house, and he keeps making problems with the neighbors' children and beating them. Everyone has been complaining about him. When his mother calls him at sunset to sleep in his room, he says I do not want to enter the prison.

Where doesn't Nabil want to enter?

REFERENCES

- [1] AbulHaija, L. (1988). The development of figurative language by Jordanian Children. *Al-Yarmouk*. 2: 54-58.
- [2] Al-Qassas, A. (2006). *Jordanian children acquisition of Arabic metaphoric language*. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Yarmouk, Irbid, Jordan.
- [3] Bosco, F., Marianna Vallana, M.& Bucciarelli, M. (2009). Comprehension of communicative intentions: The case of figurative language. *Journal of Cognitive Science*, 10: 245-277.

- [4] Cacciari, C. & Glucksberg, S. (1994). Understanding of figurative language. Gernsbacher, Morton ed., *Handbook of Psycholinguistic*, 447-477. San Diego: Academic Press.
- [5] Cacciari, C & Padovani, R. (2012). The development of figurative language. In Spivey, Michael, Ken McRae and Marc Joanisse eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of Psycholinguistics*, 505-522. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Finch, G. (2000). *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [7] Gentner, Dedre. (1988). Metaphor as structure mapping: The relational shift. *Child Development*, 59:47-59.
- [8] Glucksberg, S. (1989). Metaphors in conversation: How are they understood? Why are they used? *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 4, 125-43
- [9] Glucksberg, S. (2001). *Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphors to Idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [10] Grady, J. (1997a). Theories are building revisited. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 8: 267-290.
- [11] Grady, J. (1997b). *Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- [12] Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [14] Lakoff, G & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- [15] Lakoff, G and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- [16] Merriam-Webster: *Dictionary and Thesaurus*. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/> (Retrieved On 15 May 2022).
- [17] Ozcaliskan, S. (2003). Metaphorical motion in crosslinguistic perspective: A comparison of English and Turkish. *Metaphor & Symbol*, 18:189-228.
- [18] Pearson, B. (1990). The comprehension of metaphor by preschool children. *Journal of Child Language*, 17:185-203.
- [19] Rapp, A & Wild, B. (2011). Nonliteral language in Alzheimer dementia: A review. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 17/2:207-18.
- [20] Reynolds, R & Ortony, A. (1980). Some issues in the measurement of children's comprehension of metaphorical language. *Child Development*, 51/4: 1110-1119.
- [21] Richards, I. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [22] Rocha, J., Ferreira, C. & Alegria, R. (2021). Metaphor and Irony comprehension in typically developing school children: a pilot study. *Revista de Investigacion en Logopedia*. 11. 13-21. 10.5209/rlog.64669.
- [23] Rundblad, G & Annaz, D. (2010). Development of metaphor and metonymy comprehension: Receptive vocabulary and conceptual knowledge. *The British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 28/3:547-563.
- [24] Seitz, J. (1997). The development of metaphoric understanding: Implications for a theory of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 10/4:347-353.
- [25] Winner, E., Rosenstiel, A., & Gardner, H. (1976). The developmental of metaphoric understand-ing. *Developmental Psychology*, 12, 289-97.
- [26] Winner, E., McCarthy, M., & Gardner, H. (1980). The ontogenesis of metaphor. In: Honeck, R. and Hoffman, R. (Eds.). *Cognition and Figurative Language* (pp. 341-61). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ronza Abu Rumman holds a PhD. in Linguistics from the University of Jordan. She is a lecturer at the University of Jordan. She has taught a number of courses, such as Study and Research Skills, Communication Skills, Professional Writing and Introduction to Linguistics. Her research interests are discourse analysis and second-language acquisition. ronza1_aburumman@yahoo.com