



Ideational Metaphor in Exposition Texts in an EFL Textbook and Its Pedagogical Significance

P-ISSN 2355-2794
E-ISSN 2461-0275

M. Ibnu Mustofa*
Gin Gin Gustine

English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 40154, INDONESIA

Abstract

Analytical exposition texts feature causal relationships and nominalization, which can be explored through a grammatical metaphor framework. Despite numerous studies on analytical exposition texts and grammatical metaphors, research on grammatical metaphors in analytical exposition texts in an EFL textbook has not been extensively reported. Through a qualitative research design, particularly qualitative content analysis, this study explored the frequency and variation of ideational metaphors in four selected analytical exposition texts in an EFL textbook for tenth graders of senior high schools in Indonesia. The results show that shift from process to thing occurred most frequently (37%), followed by shift from relator to relator: circumstance (conjunction → verb) (15.8%), shift from process to process: quality (13.7%), and shift from thing to thing: class (of things) (13.1%). The other three types of shifts that occurred least frequently are shift from thing to thing: possessor (of thing) (11%), followed by shift from quality to quality: thing (6.8%), and finally, relator to relator: circumstance (conjunction → prepositional phrase) (2.6%). The pedagogical implications of this study emphasize the importance of explicit teaching of grammatical metaphor through a genre-based approach. This research offers important contributions to our understanding of EFL teachers in facilitating students with the knowledge of grammatical metaphor and nominalization for better academic writing skills.

Keywords: Analytical exposition text, grammatical metaphor, nominalization, systemic functional linguistics.

* Corresponding author, email: ibnmustofa705@gmail.com; ibnmustofa@upi.edu

Citation in APA style: Mustofa, M. I., & Gustine, G. G. (2025). Ideational metaphor in exposition texts in an EFL textbook and its pedagogical significance. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 12(2), 1052-1067.

Received October 25, 2023; Revised April 3, 2024; Accepted April 16, 2025; Published Online May 31, 2025

<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v12i2.34906>

Copyright © 2025 by Authors, published by *Studies in English Language and Education*. This is an open-access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. INTRODUCTION

Academic writing is a strict and complex task, governed by various writing conventions. Key attributes contributing to its strictness and complexity are the use of focused argumentation, evidence-based development, and formality (Maamujav et al., 2021) high lexical density, and low grammatical intricacy (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Moreover, written language is characterized by abstraction, generalization of ideas, argumentation, and reflection (Christie, 2002). Christie (2002) further added that these aspects are the characteristics of 'advanced literacy', useful for students' academic and personal lives later on. These features can be explored through grammatical metaphor, which is a common resource in persuasive texts (To et al., 2020). These concepts provided a foundation for researchers in this study to explore the use of ideational metaphors in analytical exposition texts presented in an EFL textbook as a model for students to follow.

Grammatical metaphor is part of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), within which the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) is situated. This approach has been adopted in the Indonesian education system since the release of the 2004 curriculum (Emilia, 2005; Zein et al., 2020) and continues to be applied in *Kurikulum Merdeka* (Emancipated Learning). A document released by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia (MoECRT, 2022) stated that English teaching across educational levels focused on students' English proficiencies in listening, speaking, reading, viewing, writing, and presenting various genre-based texts, one of which is an analytical exposition text. It features the use of reasoning through causal conjunctions, nominalization, noun groups, connectives, and technical terms, among others (Derewianka & Jones, 2016; Emilia, 2011), which can be explored through a grammatical metaphor framework.

Grammatical metaphor is a typical feature of academic written texts (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Zhang, 2018) that enhances texts in many ways. According to Schleppegrell (2004), it creates technicality, clear text structuring, reasoning within clauses, and a more objective author's point of view. Furthermore, it helps build anaphoric re-construal, elaborated nominal groups, cause-and-effect networks, and meaning accumulation (Liardét, 2013) through the reorganization of full clauses into nominal groups (McGrath & Liardét, 2022). It is also helpful for students in the mechanics of paraphrasing (Walsh Marr, 2019). Finally, it contributes to economic word and information density through nominalization (Ezeifeka, 2011).

Despite its crucial role in academic composition, grammatical metaphor is challenging for EFL students (Liardét, 2015) due to their unfamiliarity with the concept of grammatical metaphors (To & Thomas, 2017). Additionally, ideational metaphor is typically acquired by children at a later age and is not common in casual and everyday conversation (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Technically, grammatical metaphor results in tighter and more abstract packaging of information, making the text more difficult to read and articulate (Gerot & Wignell, 1994), particularly in its application in academic writing. Consequently, explicit L2 instruction on grammatical metaphor, mainly nominalization, is urgently needed (Afifi, 2021; Derewianka, 1995; Liardét, 2016). Furthermore, research on grammatical metaphor provides insightful information for EFL teachers about the explicit teaching of these language features.

Studies on grammatical metaphor have been well-documented over the past decades. Many studies focused on academic texts written by EFL university students (Afifi, 2021; Liardét, 2013; Nys, 2019; Yuliana, 2011) and school students (To et al., 2020). Most of these studies found an increase in grammatical metaphor use in texts written by EFL students as their education levels increase, confirming that grammatical metaphor is used by higher-level language users (Yang, 2018). Moreover, these studies reported a dominant use of verb nominalization (e.g., 'transform-transformation') in students' texts, supporting the theory that nominalization is the primary resource for grammatical metaphors (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

Previous studies have primarily examined the use of grammatical metaphor in students' final writing products, predominantly at the tertiary level. Research focusing on Indonesian schools, however, remains limited. Additionally, the exploration of grammatical metaphor in analytical exposition texts found in EFL textbooks has been largely overlooked, despite the

textbooks' central role in classroom instruction, functioning both as a well-structured syllabus (Ariyan & Pavlova, 2019) and as reliable resources for providing high-quality genre text samples during teaching through GBA.

This study seeks to address this gap by examining the grammatical metaphors in textbook texts and highlighting their implications for the explicit teaching of these language features at the secondary school level. Previous research has explored the use of grammatical metaphor in argumentative texts written by high-achieving school students (To et al., 2020) and university students (Afifi, 2021). Although conducted at different educational levels, both studies reported similar findings: a prevalence of verb nominalization and an increase in grammatical metaphor use as students advanced in grade level. However, these studies focused solely on students' final written products.

Given the critical role of textbooks in modeling texts during the teaching phase of GBA, this study extends the discussion by analyzing ideational metaphors in textbook texts and examining their pedagogical implications. This study is therefore guided by the research question:

1. What are the types of ideational metaphors used in the four analytical exposition texts in an EFL textbook?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Grammatical Metaphor

First coined by Halliday in 1985 (McGrath & Liardét, 2023), grammatical metaphor is known as a resource of meaning-making, different from the typical construction of grammar of 'ordinary life' (congruent form) (Schleppegrell, 2004). Through this feature, the relationship between semantic meaning and its lexicogrammatical realization is realigned (Martin, 1992; McGrath & Liardét, 2023) to expand the meaning potential (Thompson, 2014). Moreover, grammatical metaphor reorganizes full clauses into nominal phrases with extensive modification (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; McGrath & Liardét, 2022) to create densely organized information in the texts. In terms of SFL's metafunctions, grammatical metaphor falls into three categories: ideational, interpersonal, and textual metaphors (Derebianka, 1995). The subsequent paragraphs outline each type.

The first category is ideational metaphor, which is divided into experiential and logical metaphors (Martin, 1992). In experiential metaphor, process (verb) is realized by a thing (noun), and an adjective in lexicogrammar realizes quality (Martin, 1992). An example of experiential metaphor can be seen in E1:

- E1 Congruent: ['If (the doctor) **immobilises** (the patient) and promptly **administers** the appropriate antibiotics, the problem may occasionally be **resolved**']. (Thompson, 2014, p. 241).
Metaphorical: **Immobilisation** and the prompt **administration** of the appropriate antibiotics may occasionally lead to **resolution**. (Thompson, 2014, p. 241).

As shown in E1, the processes 'immobilises', 'administers' and 'be resolved' in the congruent mode are realized by the nouns 'immobilisation', 'administration', and 'resolution', creating a verb nominalization. On the other hand, logical metaphor focuses on the metaphorical way of realizing the consequential (cause-effect) and temporal relations within clauses (Martin, 1992), as can be seen in the following example:

- E2 Congruent: **When/Because** England **became unified** under the West Saxon kings, people **recognized** the West Saxon dialect as a literary standard. (Thompson, 2014, p. 243).
Metaphorical: **The unification** of England under the West Saxon kings **led to the recognition** of the West Saxon dialect as a literary standard. (Thompson, 2014, p. 243).

In congruent form, the cause-effect relationship is logically expressed in two clauses, dependent ('because England...') and independent ('people recognized...'), involving the relator

when/because. However, in a logical metaphorical way, the relator is removed and replaced by 'lead to', resulting in the reasoning within the clause rather than between clauses (Schleppegrell, 2004).

The second type of grammatical metaphor is called interpersonal metaphor, which consists of a metaphor of mood and a metaphor of modality (Martin, 2020). The metaphor of mood occurs when a command is realized by a declarative sentence or a statement is realized by an interrogative (Yang, 2019), rather than using a command and statement to achieve their original function. E3 is an instance of the metaphor of mood:

- E3 Congruent: Stefan, please turn off the tape.
Metaphorical: Oh. Stefan, can you turn off the tape? [Non-verbal response: tape is turned off.] (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p. 704).

Typically, a command is realized by a declarative, as shown in 'Stefan, please turn off the tape!' However, as the example of metaphor in E3 shows, command may be realized by an interrogative: 'Can you turn off the tape?' On the other hand, the metaphor of modality is the situation when "the speaker's opinion regarding the probability that his observation is valid is coded not as a modal element within the clause, which would be its congruent realization, but as a separate, projecting clause in a hypotactic clause nexus" (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p. 687). An example of the metaphor of modality is shown in E4:

- E4 Congruent: 'The Bostonians' might have been written by Henry James. (Eggins, 2004, p. 172).
Metaphorical: I think Henry James wrote 'The Bostonians'. (Eggins, 2004, p. 174).

The example in E4 shows that congruently, the speaker's opinion is expressed through the modality 'might' inside the clause. However, the opinion may be realized in a projecting clause 'I think'. Since the process 'think' represents modality might, this verb serves as a metaphorical realization of modality, instead of as a mental process.

The third category of metaphor is textual metaphor, which is a useful term when discourse systems are used to construe text as a 'material' social reality (Martin, 1992). There are four types of textual metaphor: meta-message relation (e.g., 'pointing out'), text reference (e.g., 'this'), negotiating texture (e.g., 'let me begin by'), and internal conjunction (e.g., 'a number of reasons') (Martin, 1992). While Martin (1992) and Derewianka (1995) have explored textual metaphor as a component of grammatical metaphors, textual metaphor is not explicitly mentioned in the publications of other influential scholars such as Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), Tavernier (2017), and Matthiessen and Teruya (2024). Yang (2018) proposed the removal or redefinition of the term 'textual metaphor' in the concept of SFL.

2.2 The Frameworks for Analyzing Grammatical Metaphor

According to McGrath and Liardét (2023), Ravelli (1988) was the first scholar who provide a systematic development of grammatical metaphor typology. Ravelli (1988) classified grammatical metaphors into nine general types. A similar typology was established by Halliday (1998), who classified grammatical metaphor into 13 shift types, ranging from quality → entity to entity → modifier (of entity). The framework by Derewianka (1995) divided grammatical metaphor into ideational, interpersonal, and textual ones. Ideational grammatical metaphor comprises four major shifts: shift to thing (eight sub-types), shift to quality (eight sub-types), shift to process (four sub-types), and shift to circumstance (one sub-type). Previous studies have adopted these frameworks to explore the deployment and development of grammatical metaphors in texts of various contexts and disciplines.

For instance, drawing on the framework by Halliday (1998), Yuliana (2011) and Nys (2019) explored the frequency and variation of grammatical metaphor in students' paper writing and its effects on the text characteristics. Similarly, Afifi (2021) combined the frameworks by Derewianka (1995) and Hao (2015) to explore the deployment and development of grammatical metaphor in university students' writings. Finally, using a corpus study, McGrath and Liardét

(2022) adapted the typology designed by Derewianka (1995) and Halliday and Matthiessen (1999) to explore the most common grammatical metaphor employed by successful university students.

These studies revealed the use of grammatical metaphor in students' texts as final writing. The current study aims to extend the discussion by focusing on a textbook as the research subject, informing education stakeholders of the importance of the texts presented in the textbook for assisting teachers with explicit teaching on grammatical metaphor. Therefore, the present study adopted a framework by Derewianka (1995) (see Table 2) to analyze analytical exposition texts in an EFL textbook used in Indonesia. The framework was chosen for its practical application and the provision of analysis examples.

2.3 Analytical Exposition Text

Analytical exposition texts serve as a platform for writers in a case argument and to persuade readers or listeners that something is the case, or to persuade them to a particular viewpoint (Derewianka & Jones, 2016; Emilia et al., 2018; Gerot & Wignell, 1994). As a result of its complex structure and linguistic features, the analytical genre of exposition is far more challenging than factual genres, such as reports or narratives (Beck et al., 2013). Therefore, explicit teaching to improve students' awareness of genre texts and their linguistic features is required (Damayanti et al., 2023) as university students often encounter this type of text in their writing assignments (Derewianka & Jones, 2016). Its persuasive purpose and reliance on abstract language demand a high level of language proficiency and critical thinking from students.

The generic structure of analytical exposition texts comprises a thesis, argument, and reiteration (Derewianka & Jones, 2016; Emilia et al., 2018; Gerot & Wignell, 1994). The thesis serves as the introduction to the topic and the writer's position on the issue discussed. It also presents a preview, which outlines the main arguments. The second part, a series of arguments, restates the main arguments outlined in the 'preview', followed by 'elaboration', which develops and supports each 'argument'. Finally, reiteration or restatement of the thesis recapitulates the position of the writer. This structured organization helps guide readers through the logic of the writer's viewpoint to reinforce the text's persuasive impact.

2.4 The Linguistic Features of Analytical Exposition Text

Analytical exposition texts feature the use of reasoning through causal conjunction, complex noun groups, and nominalization (Derewianka & Jones, 2016; Gerot & Wignell, 1994). Causal conjunctions serve as a ligament of the logical semantic relations between the two clauses in the compound sentence (Liu et al., 2018). Causation is marked by either explicit causative devices (e.g., 'because, so, for, due to') or implicit causative verbs (e.g., 'They made him angry') (Xuelan & Kennedy, 1992). Causal conjunctions in argument texts support the writer's reasoning.

Nominalization is a major resource for the creation of grammatical metaphors (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). It serves various functions in academic texts. First, it leads to highly dense packaged lexical items (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Additionally, it leads to a more impersonal academic tone, cohesion, coherence, and logical organization of text (Baratta, 2010; Derewianka & Jones, 2016). In addition to the abstraction and condensation of content (Gerot & Wignell, 1994). Thompson (2014) argued that nominalization encapsulates meaning and turns processes into themes in subsequent clauses.

3. METHODS

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design (Creswell & Creswell, 2022; Silverman, 2022), particularly Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA). QCA is a method through which the

meaning of qualitative material, whether verbal or visual, is described systematically (Schreier, 2012). Four texts of analytical exposition were purposively selected (Creswell & Creswell, 2022) based on several considerations. First, this type of text features the use of a causal conjunction or nominalization for reasoning (Gerot & Wignell, 1994), which can be analyzed through the grammatical metaphor framework by Derewianka (1995). Secondly, it is taught in *Kurikulum Merdeka*, or an Indonesian national curriculum emphasizing flexibility and student-centered learning (MoECRT, 2022). Moreover, the textbook from which the texts were taken serves as the main teaching resource used by EFL teachers in Indonesia. Therefore, evaluating the contents or parts of the contents of a textbook is useful to provide insights for stakeholders in education, mainly teachers and material developers. Such evaluation helps ensure that the language features presented align with curricular goals and effectively support students' language development.

3.2 Data Source and Data Collection

The data of this study were four analytical exposition texts selected from an EFL textbook entitled *Erlangga Straight Point Series (ESPS) English* for grade XI students of senior high school in Indonesia. The textbook for grade XI, instead of grade X or XII, was selected since, based on the 2013 National Curriculum, the analytical exposition texts were taught at grade XI, meaning that we could obtain the data from a textbook for grade XI. However, it should be noted that in *Kurikulum Merdeka*, analytical exposition is suggested to be taught in Phase E (Grade X) and Phase F (Grades XI and XII) (MoECRT, 2022).

The text selection process was initiated with the identification of twelve analytical exposition texts in the textbook. Subsequently, we conducted a preliminary screening to identify instances of ideational metaphors in the texts, guided by Derewianka's (1995) framework, encompassing four shift types (see 3.3 Data Analysis). Only texts deploying at least three types of shifts were retained, following a rigorous iterative process. Finally, four texts meeting the selection criteria were selected as data sources for in-depth analysis.

Each text, which serves as a data source, contains roughly 200-350 words, and the total number of words from the four texts is 1.147. All the texts deliver the writers' arguments on topics such as heating tools (Text 1), junk food (Text 2), e-cigarettes (Text 3), and caffeine (Text 4), all of which discuss their negative sides. These texts were selected for their relevance to the study's focus on argumentative language and grammatical metaphor. The information on the data source (the texts) is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The information on the data source.

Text	Title	Number of words
1	The Negative Effect of Heating Tools	209
2	The Disadvantages of Junk Food	350
3	The Bad Impact of E-cigarettes	315
4	The Negative Effect of Caffeine	273
Total		1.147

As shown in Table 1, the study uses a limited number of data sources, which is justifiable given that "the point of qualitative research is to say a lot about a little" (Silverman, 2022, p. 462). This focused approach allows for an in-depth analysis of grammatical metaphor in each text.

3.3 Data Analysis

Upon the data collection, the four texts were thoroughly analyzed to identify the occurrences of ideational metaphor, adhering to Derewianka's (1995) Framework. Any types of ideational metaphors identified were recorded in a structured analysis table, with iterative processes to ensure accuracy. Total occurrences across the texts were then calculated, and the findings were presented in a table within the Results section. Table 2 displays the types and subtypes of ideational metaphors employed in this study.

As Table 3 shows, the text analysis indicates that the shift from process to thing occurred most frequently (37%), followed by the shift from relator to relator: circumstance (conjunction → verb) (15.8%), the shift from process to process: quality (13.7%), and the shift from thing to thing: class (of things) (13.1%). The other three types of shifts that occurred less frequently are the shift from thing to thing: possessor (of thing) (11%), followed by the shift from quality to quality: thing (6.8%), and finally, the shift from relator to relator: circumstance (conjunction → prepositional phrase) (2.6%). The following is a detailed explanation of findings from each type and sub-type of ideational metaphors.

4.2 Type 1: Shift to Thing

The first type of ideational metaphor identified in this study is the shift to thing, which comprises the shift from quality to thing and the shift from process to thing. Both subtypes of the shift are identified in the four texts, except for the shift from quality to thing in Text 3. The total number of occurrences of these shifts is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Shift to thing.

Semantic shift	Class shift	Number of occurrences				Total (%)
		Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4	
quality → quality: thing	adjective → noun	5	3	0	5	13 (6.8%)
process → process: thing	verb → noun	13	23	17	17	70 (37%)

First, Table 4 shows that there are a total of 13 occurrences of the shift from quality to thing across the four texts, representing 6.8% of the total shifts. In this shift, the adjective is transformed into a noun. An instance of the shift from quality to thing can be seen in Text 4, as shown in (1):

(1) [Text 4]

- A. Grammatical metaphor: A large amount of caffeine causes **anxiety**. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 101).
- B. Possible congruent structure: A large amount of caffeine makes people **anxious**.

The word ‘anxiety’ in clause A is a shift from quality to thing (adjective → noun). The adjective ‘anxious’ (clause B) is transformed into the noun ‘anxiety’ through the addition of the suffix ‘-ity.’ Other class shifts from adjective to noun are marked with various suffixes such as ‘-nce’ (as in ‘confident–confidence’), ‘-ncy’ (as in ‘dependent–dependency’), and ‘-ness’ (as in ‘alert–alertness’). It shows that suffixes are required to transform an adjective into a noun. However, another shift from adjective to noun is irregular in form, such as ‘strong–strength’.

Secondly, Table 4 demonstrates the shift from process to thing (verb → noun), which occurred 70 times, making it the highest number of ideational metaphors identified across the four texts. One instance of the shift from process to thing is shown in (2):

(2) [Text 1]

- A. Grammatical metaphor: Constant use of heating can cause permanent **damage** to the hair. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 77).
- B. Possible congruent structure: Constant use of heating can permanently **damage** the hair.

The word ‘damage’ in clause A is a noun resulting from the shift from process to thing with the same form of the word ‘damage’. In clause B, the word ‘damage’ is a noun, while in the possible congruent structure, ‘damage’ is a verb. As clauses A and B show, there is no morphological change to the word ‘damage’. This is called a homonym, referring to a word with the same spelling and sound but different meanings. Other words, however, require morphological transformation, as in example (3), which shows a shift from process to thing:

(3) [Text 3]

- A. Grammatical metaphor: Nicotine seriously affects brain **development**. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 83).
- B. Possible congruent structure: Nicotine seriously affects how the brain **develops**.

In the grammatical metaphor version (clause A), the word ‘development’ is a noun, while in the possible congruent structure (clause B), ‘develop’ is a verb. The morphological transformation from the verb to the noun involves the suffix ‘-ment’. Another suffix that transforms a verb into a noun is ‘-ion’ (e.g., ‘dehydrate → dehydration’ and ‘consume → consumption’). Some verbs require an irregular morphological change, as shown in (4):

(4) [Text 1]

- A. Grammatical metaphor: It causes moisture **loss** in hair. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 77).
B. Possible congruent structure: It makes the hair **lose** moisture.

In (4), the verb lose in clause B takes an irregular form of transformation to the noun ‘loss’ (clause A). This transformation does not follow the standard rules for forming nouns from verbs, such as adding ‘-ment’ or ‘-ion’. The other processes with irregular forms of transformation found in the texts are ‘believe → belief’ and ‘bear → birth’.

4.3. Type 2: Shift to Quality

Shift to quality is the transformation of other word classes into adjectives. Shifts to quality found in this study comprise three sub-types: thing to quality, thing to the possessor (of thing), and process to quality. The number of occurrences of each subtype is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Shift to quality.

Semantic shift	Class shift	Number of occurrences				Total (%)
		Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4	
thing → thing: class (of things)	noun head → noun premodifier	5	5	6	9	25 (13.1%)
thing → thing: possessor (of thing)	noun head → possessive determiner	3	7	2	9	21 (11%)
process → process: quality	verb → adjective	6	6	6	8	26 (13.7%)

As Table 5 demonstrates, there are three sub-types of shifts to quality: thing to thing: class (of things), shift from thing to thing: possessor (of thing), and process to process: quality. In total, there are 72 times of occurrences of shift to quality. The detailed presentation of each subtype is as follows.

First, Table 5 shows the shift from thing → thing: class (of things), or noun head → noun premodifier. This type of shift occurred 25 times across the four texts, representing 13.1% of the total shifts. (5) is an instance of word transformation from thing to thing: class of things, derived from Text 1.

(5) [Text 1]

- A. Grammatical metaphor: The use of heating tools can cause **moisture** loss in your hair. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 77).
B. Possible congruent structure: The use of heating tools can make your hair lose **moisture**.

Originally, the word ‘moisture’ in clause A is a thing (noun). However, since two nouns come together in the clause, the former is considered a noun premodifier, which provides additional information to the head noun ‘loss’ to make its meaning more specific. In congruent mode (clause B), the word ‘moisture’ is a head noun given that it stands on its own.

Secondly, as Table 5 demonstrates, the second sub-type of the shift to quality is from thing → thing: possessor (of thing), which occurred 21 times (11%). The instance of word transformation from thing to thing: possessor (of thing) is shown in (6).

(6) [Text 3]

- A. Grammatical metaphor: To cope with **their** addiction. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 83).
B. Possible congruent structure: To cope with the addiction of **the smokers**.

In clause A, ‘their’ is a possessive pronoun, followed by the noun ‘addiction.’ In clause B, the possessive pronoun is replaced by the thing (noun) ‘the smokers,’ resulting in several repetitions of the same thing. Through the use of possessive pronouns instead of nouns, the repetition of the same noun or phrase can be avoided. Using possessive pronouns instead of repeating the same nouns or phrases not only avoids redundancy but also enhances the flow and clarity of the writing.

Finally, the third sub-type of the shift to quality is from process to process: quality, representing 13.7% of the grammatical metaphor. When located just before a noun or a pronoun, a process serves as an adjective that modifies a noun or pronoun. (7) is an instance of a shift from process to quality:

- (7) [Text 3]
 A. Grammatical metaphor: It even harms the **developing** brains of unborn babies. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, P. 83).
 B. Possible congruent structure: It even harms the brains of unborn babies that **are developing**.

In the phrase ‘the developing brains’ (Text 3), ‘developing’ is considered the adjective of the noun ‘brains.’ The word ‘developing’ comes from the verb ‘develop’. Therefore, there is a shift from process to quality (verb → adjective). Another type of ‘-ing’ suffixed adjective is an ‘-ed’ (or the equivalent verb 3) adjective. In example (8), the adjective ‘exaggerated’ comes from the verb ‘exaggerate’.

- (8) [Text 4]
 A. Grammatical metaphor: Excessive consumption of caffeine may lead to an **exaggerated** effect. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, pp. 101-102).
 B. Possible congruent structure: Excessive consumption of caffeine may lead to an effect that **exaggerates**.

To sum up, the process of converting a process into a quality (verb → adjective) can occur in two main ways: as a gerund ‘-ing’ and as a past participle (verb 3). However, despite their similarity, both types of adjectives have different meanings. The adjective derived from the present participle or gerund describes an ongoing quality related to the action of the verb. On the other hand, the adjective derived from the past participle describes a state or quality resulting from a completed action or a passive state.

4.4. Type 3: Shift to Process

Shift to process is the third type of ideational metaphor. There is only one subtype of the shift to process identified in this study: the shift from relator → relator: circumstance (conjunction → verb). The number of occurrences of this shift is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Shift to process.

Semantic shift	Class shift	Number of occurrences				Total (%)
		Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4	
relator → relator: circumstance	conjunction → verb	7	9	2	12	30 (15.8%)

Table 6 shows that the shift to process occurs 30 times (15.8%). The subtype of the shift to process found in this study is the shift from relator to relator: circumstance (conjunction to verb). (9) is an instance of this type of shift.

- (9) [Text 2]
 A. Grammatical metaphor: Fast food consumption can also **lead to** the loss of essential nutrients. (one clause) (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 78).
 B. Possible congruent structure: **If** people consume fast food, they will lose essential nutrients. (two clauses)

In more detail, the possible congruent structure consists of a dependent and an independent clause, as presented in (10):

- (10) Independent clause: **If** people consume fast food
 Dependent clause: They will lose essential nutrients

In clause A (the incongruent structure), there is only one clause, while in clause B, there are two (a dependent and an independent clause). Clause B is preceded by the conjunction ‘if,’ while in clause A (the incongruent one), the conjunction is left out, and the two clauses in the congruent form are restructured as one clause. In other words, the removal of the conjunction in an incongruent structure is followed by the occurrence of the verb lead to. Therefore, there is a shift from the conjunction ‘if’ to the verb ‘lead to’. (11) is another example from Text 4:

- (11) [Text 4]
 A. Grammatical metaphor: Lastly, too much caffeine [consumption] can **cause** muscle breakdown. (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, pp. 101-102).
 B. Possible congruent structure: Lastly, **because** people consume too much caffeine, their muscles break down.

As shown in the two examples in (11), ‘if’ and ‘because’ conjunctions are replaced by the verbs ‘cause’ and ‘lead to’. The replacement of conjunctions by verbs results in a reduction in the number of clauses.

4.5 Type 4: Shift to Circumstance

In shift to circumstance, there is only one subtype: a shift from relator to relator: circumstance (conjunction → prepositional phrase). Through this shift, the clause beginning with a conjunction may be downgraded as a prepositional phrase. Table 7 provides the complete information on the number of occurrences of the shift to circumstance.

Table 7. Shift to circumstance.

Semantic shift	Class shift	Number of occurrences				Total (%)
		Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4	
relator → relator: circumstance	conjunction → prepositional phrase	0	1	3	1	5 (2.6%)

Table 7 shows that a shift to circumstance occurred only a few times across the texts. While Texts 2, 3, and 4 contain at least one occurrence, there is no shift to circumstance identified in Text 1. The instance of the shift from relator to relator: circumstance is shown in (12):

- (12) [Text 3]
 A. Grammatical metaphor: **Despite** the belief that... (a phrase) (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 83).
 B. Possible congruent structure: **Even though** many people believe that... (a clause)

In Text 3, phrase A is the incongruent form of clause B. The relator ‘even though’ in clause B is transformed into a circumstance (adverbial phrase) ‘despite the belief’ in phrase A. There is a downgrade from the clause ‘even though many people believe’ to the phrase ‘despite the belief’. However, there are some clauses in the texts that employ a relator to express an argument, instead of using an ideational metaphor (using a prepositional phrase beginning with ‘despite’). (13) is an instance showing a causal relationship congruently through two clauses.

- (13) [Text 3]
 A. Congruent structure: **Even though** e-cigarettes **contain** fewer toxic chemicals than regular cigarettes, some of the substances in e-cigarettes **are** really harmful to the body. (two clauses) (ESPS Grade XI, 2019, p. 83).
 B. Possible grammatical metaphor: **Despite** the fewer toxic chemicals in e-cigarettes than regular ones, some of the substances in e-cigarettes **are** really harmful to the body. (one clause)

As shown in (12), clause A (the congruent structure) needs two clauses, dependent (beginning with ‘even though’) and independent (beginning with ‘some of the substances’). Meanwhile, clause B (the possible incongruent structure) only requires one clause, preceded by a prepositional phrase ‘despite the fewer’. It shows how grammatical metaphor reduces the grammatical intricacy of the text.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 The Deployment of Ideational Metaphors in the Texts

This study revealed the dominant use of the shift from process to thing, known as nominalization, in all four texts analyzed, indicating that the analytical exposition texts fulfil their linguistic feature, particularly nominalization (Derewianka & Jones, 2016; Gerot & Wignell, 1994). Moreover, the highest frequency of the shift from process to thing in this study strongly resonates with a previous study by To (2018), who revealed the upward trajectory of nominalization in the reading texts in the EFL textbooks used in Vietnamese upper intermediate schools. This finding is also similar to previous studies investigating grammatical metaphors in the academic texts written by students at tertiary (Afifi, 2021; Liardét, 2015; McGrath & Liardét, 2022; Nys, 2019; Peng, 2023; Yuliana, 2011) and school levels (Derewianka, 1995; To et al., 2020). The consistent and significant prevalence of verb nominalization across various academic texts and levels of education underscores its status as a fundamental resource for creating grammatical metaphors (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

The shift from relator to relator: circumstance (e.g., ‘if’ → ‘result in/cause/lead to’) exhibits the second highest frequency of occurrence. The use of verbs such as ‘result in, cause, or lead to’ helps the texts fulfil their language features, particularly in generating concise arguments through reasoning within the clause (Schleppegrell, 2004) and justifying the writers’ assertions in an academically appropriate way (Liardét, 2013). Moreover, it is also significant in helping describe the relationships between the nominal groups (Thompson, 2014). Moreover, the conjunctions ‘if’ and ‘because’ are more common in spoken than written language (Maamujav et al., 2021). However, compared to the current research, a previous study (Nys, 2019) reported many fewer occurrences of this shift type in students’ texts, despite its significance in academic writings, which tends to depend on simple cause/effect relations for reasoning (Rose & Martin, 2012).

The shift from process to quality and the shift from thing to quality have the third and fourth highest number of occurrences, respectively. These types of shifts are crucial for enhancing information density within the texts through the packing of multiple layers of meaning into a phrase. As shown in the findings, the use of process and thing in congruent mode would require additional clauses or phrases to convey the same information. Therefore, these shifts help the texts embrace the features of a written text by increasing the lexical density and reducing grammatical intricacy (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). In regard to previous studies, the current research showed a much greater frequency of shift from process to quality and shifts from thing to quality, in comparison to the texts composed by university students (Afifi, 2021; Liardét, 2015). Therefore, it could be implied that the writer’s proficiency may contribute to the use of these shift types.

The type of grammatical metaphor with the least frequency in this research is the shift from relator to circumstance, confirming previous studies by Nys (2019) and Yuliana (2011). Nys (2019) reported less than 3% of this grammatical metaphor type in both high and low-marked students’ papers. Similarly, Yuliana (2011) reported the low occurrence of logical metaphor in nine papers written by post-graduate students, particularly the shift from relator to circumstance. These studies confirmed the seminal study by Derewianka (1995), who found no instances of the shift to circumstance in students’ texts. One possible explanation for the low frequency of this type of shift is that students are more familiar with the use of the conjunction ‘because + clause’ than the prepositional phrase.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

Generally, the findings show that ideational metaphors have been widely used in the four analytical texts analyzed in this study, with marked variation and frequency. We argue that the texts may serve as an appropriate model to help the teachers with the explicit teaching of the use of grammatical metaphors in analytical exposition texts. Explicit teaching on grammatical metaphor can be conducted through four stages of GBA, which have also been adopted by

previous authors to teach grammatical metaphors (see Devrim, 2015; Walsh Marr, 2019). Teaching through GBA involves four main steps: Building Knowledge of the Field (BKoF), Modelling, Joint Construction, and Independent Construction.

In the building knowledge of the field phase, the teacher needs to introduce abstract and technical terms related to the topic, which are generally constructed through grammatical metaphors and nominalization. This is in line with Derewianka and Jones (2016), who explained that the focus of BKoF is developing learners' language pertinent to the field or topic under discussion. Derewianka and Jones (2016) further emphasized the importance of teachers' role in extending the learners' commonsense understanding into more abstract and subject-specific knowledge known as technical terms.

Then, during the modelling phase, the teacher needs to provide students with well-selected modelling texts to illustrate the analysis of different types of grammatical metaphors. Teachers may start by explaining verb nominalization ('develop–development') and adjective nominalization ('creative–creativity'), in addition to explaining the structure, purpose, and other language features of the text (Derewianka & Jones, 2016). This phase is crucial for teaching students grammatical metaphors and nominalization explicitly to help them avoid making mistakes in word spelling in their writing, e.g., writing 'modernitation' (sic) instead of 'modernization,' or 'choise' (sic) instead of 'choice,' as reported by Afifi (2021).

However, learning technical terms or practicing trans-categorization of texts (e.g., changing verbal to nominal) is insufficient (Schleppegrell, 2004) and may be simplistic (Derewianka & Jones, 2016) and counter-productive (Thompson, 2009). Teachers need to guide students to connect the nominalizations and technical terms within the clause to compact information and to move efficiently from what is known to what is new in their texts (Schleppegrell, 2004). To this end, the teacher could emphasize more the use of reasoning using logical metaphors, including through the use of verbs ('cause, lead to, or result in'), prepositions ('because of, due to,' or 'as a result of'), and things derived from conjunctions ('the cause, the reason'). The teacher may highlight the use of prepositions (e.g., 'because of') and things derived from conjunctions (e.g., 'the cause') due to the scarcity of these types of grammatical metaphors in the texts, as reported in this study and previous research.

During the joint and independent construction phases of the GBA process, teachers may help students transfer their spoken ideas to academic, written-like language (Derewianka & Jones, 2016) and instruct them to unpack texts containing nominalised sentences into more spoken-like language. Unpacking or transferring grammatical metaphors to the congruent or spoken mode is crucial to facilitate students' understanding of these language features (Rose & Martin, 2012). It will help guide students to express their ideas using technical terms and abstract words comprehensively generated from nominalization. Once they have mastery of this aspect, they are expected to be able to independently construct a text embracing the characteristics of academic texts. Hu and Perez (2022) found that there are positive effects of explicit instruction in nominalization on ESL learners' academic writing.

6. CONCLUSION

Analytical exposition text features causal relationships and nominalization, which can be explored through a framework of grammatical metaphor. The current study aimed to probe into the deployment of ideational metaphor in four analytical exposition texts in an EFL textbook designed for students in Indonesian senior high schools. The findings showed the most frequent shift was from process to thing (37%), followed by the shift from relator to relator: circumstance ('conjunction → verb') (15.8%), the shift from process to process: quality (13.7%), and the shift from thing to thing: class (13.1%). The three other shifts with the lowest percentages were shifts from thing to thing: possessor (11%), quality to quality: thing (6.8%), and relator to relator: circumstance ('conjunction → prepositional phrase') (2.6%). The results indicate a prevalence of the shift from process to thing (nominalization) across the texts. The findings of the present study imply the crucial role of the teacher in providing explicit teaching of grammatical metaphors

through the GBA process, throughout the steps of Building Knowledge of the Field, Modelling, Joint Construction, and Independent Construction.

The present study comes with a limitation. There were only four texts analyzed. Therefore, results are highly contextual and are not generalizable. Future research should investigate a larger data set or corpus study for a general representation of findings. Additionally, prospective researchers in this field should consider conducting experimental research on the explicit teaching of grammatical metaphor at school levels to help students' understanding and skills in deploying grammatical metaphor in their academic writings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was financially supported by *Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan* (Indonesian Education Endowment Fund for Education) under the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia (2024) [Funding Reference Number: PD1232024050900070].

REFERENCES

- Afifi, N. (2021). Exploring the use of grammatical metaphor in Indonesian EFL learners' academic writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 718-730. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31759>
- Ariyan, M. A., & Pavlova, L. V. (2019). An English language textbook: A friend or a foe? In Z. Anikina (Ed.), *Going global through social sciences and humanities: A systems and ICT perspective* (Vol. 907, pp. 83-90). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11473-2_10
- Baratta, A. M. (2010). Nominalization development across an undergraduate academic degree program. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(4), 1017-1036. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.08.007>
- Beck, S. W., Llosa, L., & Fredrick, T. (2013). The challenges of writing exposition: Lessons from a study of ELL and non-ELL high school students. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 29(4), 358-380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2013.758938>
- Christie, F. (2002). The development of abstraction in adolescence in subject of English. In M. J. Schleppegrell & M. C. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power* (pp. 45-66). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Damayanti, I. L., Hamied, F. A., Kartika-Ningsih, H., & Dharma, N. S. (2023). Building knowledge about language for teaching IELTS writing tasks: A genre-based approach. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(2), 756-776. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i2.26957>
- Derewianka, B. (1995). *Language development in the transition from childhood to adolescence: The role of grammatical metaphor* [Doctoral dissertation, Macquarie University]. Macquarie University Research Data Repository. <https://doi.org/10.25949/19440512.v1>
- Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2016). *Teaching language in context* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Devrim, D. Y. (2015). *Teaching grammatical metaphor: Designing pedagogical interventions*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed). Continuum.
- Emilia, E. (2005). *A critical genre-based approach to teaching academic writing in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne]. Minerva Access. <http://hdl.handle.net/11343/39548>
- Emilia, E. (2011). *Pendekatan genre-based dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris: Petunjuk untuk guru* [Genre-based approach in English teaching: A guide for teachers]. Rizqi Press.

- Emilia, E., Habibi, N., & Bangga, L. A. (2018). An analysis of cohesion of exposition texts: An Indonesian context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 515-523. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9791>
- Ezeifeka, C. R. (2011). Grammatical metaphor in SFL: A rhetorical resource for academic writing. *UJAH: Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 12(3), 207-221. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ujah/article/view/102623>
- Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar: An introductory workbook*. Antipodean Educational Enterprises.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1998). Language and knowledge: The 'unpacking' of text. In D. Allison, L. Wee, B. Zhiming, & S. A. Abraham (Eds.), *Text in Education and Society* (pp. 157-178). Singapore University Press. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812815781_0010
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1999). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition*. Cassell.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hao, J. (2015). *Construing biology: An ideational perspective* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sydney]. Sydney eScholarship Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/2123/13955>
- Hu, G., & Perez, M. R. (2022). Effects of explicit instruction in nominalisation on ESL learners' academic writing. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, 43(1), 27-54. <https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.43.27>
- Liardét, C. (2013). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' deployment of grammatical metaphor: Learning to make academically valued meanings. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(2), 161-178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.008>
- Liardét, C. (2015). Academic literacy and grammatical metaphor: Mapping development. *TESOL International Journal*, 10(1), 29-46. <https://researchers.mq.edu.au/en/publications/academic-literacy-and-grammatical-metaphor-mapping-development>
- Liardét, C. (2016). Nominalization and grammatical metaphor: Elaborating the theory. *English for Specific Purposes*, 44, 16-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.04.004>
- Liu, Z., Xu, X., Zhou, Y., & Li, X. (2018). Research on the application of causal conjunctions in college students' English writing. In *Proceedings of the 2018 3rd International Conference on Modern Management, Education Technology, and Social Science (MMETSS 2018)* (pp. 188-193). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/mmetss-18.2018.39>
- Maamuujuv, U., Olson, C. B., & Chung, H. (2021). Syntactic and lexical features of adolescent L2 students' academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 53(1), 100822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100822>
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Martin, J. R. (2020). Metaphors we feel by: Stratal tension. *Journal of World Languages*, 6(1-2), 8-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21698252.2020.1720158>
- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., & Teruya, K. (2024). *Systemic functional linguistics: A complete guide* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315675718>
- McGrath, D., & Liardét, C. (2022). A corpus-assisted analysis of grammatical metaphors in successful student writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 56(1), 101090. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101090>
- McGrath, D., & Liardét, C. (2023). Grammatical metaphor across disciplines: Variation, frequency, and dispersion. *English for Specific Purposes*, 69(1), 33-47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2022.09.003>
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia. (2022). *Capaian pembelajaran pada pendidikan anak usia dini, jenjang pendidikan dasar, dan jenjang pendidikan menengah pada Kurikulum Merdeka* [Learning outcomes in early childhood education, basic education, and secondary education in Kurikulum Merdeka]. Jakarta. https://kurikulum.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/unduhan/CP_2022.pdf

- Nys, M. (2019). *Grammatical metaphor in non-native English academic writing: A comparison of higher-marked and lower-marked papers written by non-native university students*. [Master's Thesis, Ghent University]. UGent Network. <https://lib.ugent.be/catalog/rug01:002790035>
- Peng, S. (2023). A probe into academic English writing from the perspective of ideational grammatical metaphor: A study of 30 IELTS argumentative essays. *Modern Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics*, 2(1), 1-7. <https://www.jhkpress.com/index.php/mlll/article/view/80>
- Ravelli, L. J. (1988). Grammatical metaphor: An initial analysis. In E. H. Steiner & R. Veltman (Eds.), *Pragmatics, discourse and text: Some systemically-oriented approaches* (pp. 133-147). Pinter.
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney School*. Equinox.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). Technical writing in a second language: The role of grammatical metaphor. In L. J. Ravelli & R. A. Ellis (Eds.), *Analysing academic writing: Contextualized frameworks* (pp. 172-189). Continuum.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage Publications.
- Silverman, D. (2022). *Doing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Taverniers, M. (2017). Grammatical metaphor. In T. Bartlett & G. O'Grady (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of systemic functional linguistics* (pp. 354-371). Routledge.
- Thompson, G. (2009). Grammatical metaphor and success in academic writing. In S. Hunston & D. Oakey (Eds.), *Introducing applied linguistics* (pp. 43-52). Routledge.
- Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- To, V. (2018). Linguistic complexity analysis: A case study of commonly-used textbooks in Vietnam. *Sage Open*, 8(3), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018787586>
- To, V., & Thomas, D. (2017). Examining interpersonal metaphor of modality in successful primary persuasive texts. In *Transforming Contexts: Papers from the 44th International Systemic Functional Congress* (pp. 75-81). ISFC Organising Committee. http://www.isfla.org/Systemics/Conferences/ISFC_2017_Proceedings.pdf
- To, V., Thomas, D., & Thomas, A. (2020). Writing persuasive texts: Using grammatical metaphors for rhetorical purposes in an educational context. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 40(2), 139-159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2020.1732867>
- Walsh Marr, J. (2019). Making the mechanics of paraphrasing more explicit through Grammatical Metaphor. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 42(1), 100783. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100783>
- Xuelan, F. & Kennedy, G. (1992). Expressing causation in written English. *RELJ Journal*, 23(1), 62-80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829202300105>
- Yang, B. (2018). Textual metaphor revisited. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 38(2), 205-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2018.1400502>
- Yang, B. (2019). Interpersonal metaphor revisited: Identification, categorization, and syndrome. *Social Semiotics*, 29(2), 186-203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2018.1425322>
- Yuliana, Y. (2011). *An investigation of grammatical metaphor in students' writing and its effects on the texts' written characteristics* [Master's thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia]. Repository UPI. <http://repository.upi.edu/9953/>
- Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011–2019). *Language Teaching*, 53(4), 491-523. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208>
- Zhang, Y. (2018). Examining the application of grammatical metaphors in academic writing. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 8(2), 108-114. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v8n2p108>