

## **What counts as a multimodal metaphor (and metonymy)? Evolution of inter-rater reliability and agreement within and across seven rounds of adverts annotation**

Paula Pérez-Sobrino<sup>1</sup> & Samantha Ford<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>University of La Rioja, Spain; <sup>2</sup>University of Birmingham, UK

In order to explore variables that play a role in the identification of multimodal metaphor and metonymy, two researchers annotated 35 generic advertisements in 5 rounds of 7 advertisements and 2 rounds of 15 genre-specific mobile phone advertisements. Both researchers followed the same set of instructions: (1) formulating the main message of the advert; (2) identifying the product or salient product (i.e. the target); (3) eliciting what is being said about the product or its related attributes (i.e. the source); and finally, (4) deciding whether the relationship between the product/attributes and what is said about them is metaphoric or metonymic. For each advert, the coders annotated individually the presence of metaphor and metonymy and the respective metaphoric or metonymic label.

The goal of this series of annotations was to know whether there was any variation in the reliability with which metaphor and metonymy were identified (within and across rounds) and if (b) there was any variation in the reliability with which the metaphoric and metonymic labels were formulated (within and across rounds). The coders reviewed their individual annotations jointly at the end of each round, and the protocol was revised after each round.

Our results show that there was a fair degree of agreement between the researchers in the detection of metaphor (and to a lesser extent of metonymy) in both generic and genre-specific advertisements. However, this trend was not paralleled in terms of labels, mainly due to the absence of a definite list of labels to rely upon to verbalise the source and target domains. Finally, we observed that the degree of agreement between the coders increased throughout the seven rounds, showing the positive effects of annotation training, joint annotation, and group discussion of controversial examples.

### **References**

- Dunn, J. (2014). Measuring metaphoricity. *ACL*. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/p14-2121>
- Forceville, C. J. (2009). Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research. In C. J. Forceville & E. Urios-Aparisi (Eds.), *Multimodal Metaphor* (pp. 19–44). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ford, S. (2017) *Multimodal Metaphor and Metonymy and the Figurative Complexity of Mobile Phone Advertising: A Comparison Between Mobile Phone Manufacturer and Network Provider Advertisements*. (Bachelor's dissertation, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom). Retrieved from: <https://samantha-ford.weebly.com/publications.html>.
- Hanks, P. (2006). Metaphoricity is Gradable. In A. Stefanowitsch & S. Gries (Eds.), *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics vol.1: Metaphor and Metonymy*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Julich-Warpakowski, N. (2019). Why do we understand music as moving?: The metaphorical basis of musical motion revisited. In L. J. Speed, C. O'Meara, L. San Roque, & A. Majid (Eds.), *Converging Evidence in Language and Communication Research* (Vol. 19, pp. 165–184). <https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.19.09jul>
- Müller, C. (2009). *Metaphors Dead and Alive, Sleeping and Waking, A Dynamic View*. Retrieved from <https://www.degruyter.com/view/product/535157>
- Pérez-Sobrino, P. (2016). Multimodal Metaphor and Metonymy in Advertising: A Corpus- Based Account. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 31(2), 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2016.1150759>
- Pérez-Sobrino, P. (2017). *Multimodal metaphor and metonymy in advertising*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.