

**METAPHORICAL EXPRESSIONS FOUND IN THE JUDGES'  
EVALUATIONS TOWARD THE FINALISTS' PERFORMANCES IN  
AMERICAN IDOL**

A Thesis

*Submitted on Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement For Degree of  
Sarjana Sastra*

**DWI TIYA SARI**

05 985 004



**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT  
FACULTY OF LETTERS  
ANDALAS UNIVERSITY  
PADANG  
2010**



## ABSTRAK

Di dalam penelitian ini dibahas elemen pembentuk, jenis, dan makna metafora yang terdapat dalam ujaran juri *American Idol* ketika membuat penilaian terhadap penampilan 12 peserta terbaik di tahun 2006 – 2008. Dalam hal pengumpulan data, peneliti menggunakan metode observasi tak langsung (*non participant observation method*). Peneliti hanya mengamati dan mengidentifikasi metafora dalam transkrip hasil rekaman video yang diperoleh dari internet. Dalam hal ini teknik catat (*note taking technique*) digunakan untuk membantu pelaksanaan transkripsi.

Penelitian ini menggunakan konsep metafora yang dikemukakan oleh George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. Selanjutnya metafora dianalisis dengan menggunakan metode padan pragmatik (*pragmatic identity method*), yaitu menginterpretasi metafora baik elemen pembentuknya, jenis metafora dan makna metafora berdasarkan konteks atau situasi ketika metafora itu diucapkan. Hasil analisis kemudian disajikan secara deskriptif dan menggunakan tabel untuk membantu penyajian hasil analisis.

Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa metafora yang diucapkan oleh juri *American Idol* tersebut terbentuk dari kombinasi antara topik yang dibicarakan dalam metafora (*target domain*) dan analoginya (*source domain*). Tipe metafora dari abstrak ke konkrit (*from concrete to abstract metaphor*), metafora perasaan (*synaesthetic metaphor*) dan metafora hewan (*animal metaphor*) adalah tipe metafora yang digunakan oleh juri dalam mengevaluasi penampilan 12 peserta terbaik di tahun 2006 – 2008. Selain itu, metafora yang diucapkan oleh juri dalam mengevaluasi penampilan peserta tersebut lebih mengacu kepada pujian (*compliment*) terhadap penampilan para peserta.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background of the Study

Transferring the message and expressing something does not always use the words that have literal meaning. It means that there are certain ways to express people's ideas, thoughts, feeling that have to be interpreted based on the context. In this case, figurative language is a possible way.

Reaske (1966: 59) states that "figurative language as state things in other than literal ways". Perrine (1985: 571) also explains that "figurative language often provides a more effective means of saying what we mean than does direct statement". Based on the understanding above, it can be concluded that figurative language cannot be taken literally. It is another way of adding extra dimension to the language.

Nowadays, figurative languages have important position in any activities. Figurative languages can connect society in building a communication by using wonderful words that have hidden meaning behind it. In other word, someone will make a language as interesting as possible through the figurative languages to create certain feeling toward other people.

In some senses, figurative languages are the reflection of the environment, knowledge background, culture, etc. To get the appropriate meaning from the figurative utterances, the hearer must be interpreting the meaning based on the situation. Otherwise, the message of the figurative languages will not be changed.

A type of figurative language which is frequently used by people is metaphor. Metaphor enables someone to be creative in making ordinary language become more interesting and meaningful. Grice (in Levinson, 1987: 147) states that "metaphor is not only central to poetry and indeed to a very large proportion of ordinary language usage, but also to realms as diverse as the interpretation of dreams and the nature of models in scientific thought". Bonvillain (1997: 66) also said that "metaphor is based on unstated comparisons between entities or events that share certain features". He also reports that "metaphor is once a no concrete entity is transformed into an object, it can be contained, entered, left, held, or the like".

One of the problems in analyzing the metaphor is the difficulty to catch correctly the meaning of metaphor. In this case, someone has to allow cultural aspect and context to interpret the meaning, because each metaphor has different message from the speaker. The metaphor like: *Sally is block of ice*, *my mother is an angel*, and *she is my alarm clock* will build misunderstanding and incorrect meaning if those metaphors are interpreted literally. Moreover, if those metaphors are analyzed based on the figurative perspective, those metaphors are meaningful. Based on those facts, this research is conducted to diminish misunderstanding the message from the metaphor.

To gain the purpose of this research, metaphorical expressions in the judges' evaluations toward the finalists' performances of American Idol in three seasons (season 5, 6, and 7) from 2006 until 2008 are chosen as the data in this research. In each season is more focused on the 12 finalists' performances. Those American Idol

seasons have a lot of metaphors than other seasons. The metaphorical expressions which are expressed by the judges (Randy Jackson, Paula Abdul, Simon Cowell) also reflects to the metaphor used by people in daily life. This is used to make the utterance become more meaningful and wonderful than when it is delivered literally.

## **1.2 Identification of the Problem**

Expressing the ideas metaphorically will enable people to express an utterance more meaningful than when it is said literally. Interpreting the meaning of metaphor incorrectly will make misunderstanding to the hearer. This research is focused on the three problems that will be analyzed. They are:

- 1. What are the types and forms of metaphor used by American Idol judges in giving evaluations toward the finalists' performances?*
- 2. What are the meanings of metaphorical expressions found in the judges' evaluations toward the finalists' performances in American Idol?*

## **1.3. Objectives of the Research**

This research is conducted to achieve two purposes. The first aim is to identify the form and the types of the metaphor found in the judges' evaluations about the finalists' performances in three seasons of American Idol. The second one is to interpret the meanings of the metaphorical expressions based on the context when the metaphors are uttered by the judges. The writer also identifies the relationship

## CHAPTER 4

### CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, the writer figures out several points. First, forms of metaphor which are used by the judges of American Idol when giving the evaluations to the finalists' performances consist of source domain as the concrete and familiar part, while target domain is the main topic of metaphor. Moreover, a metaphor transfers the characteristics or properties from source domain to target domain.

Second, from eleven data of metaphor, there are three types of metaphor appear in this analysis. They are: eight metaphors are categorized as "from concrete to abstract" metaphor, two metaphors are categorized as "synaesthetic" metaphor and one metaphor is categorized as "animal" metaphor. It shows that the judges use three types of metaphor when giving evaluations toward the finalists' performances in the American Idol. Third, the result of the analysis shows that each of the eleven metaphors has its own meaning based on the context. The meanings of the metaphorical expressions dominantly refer to the compliments which are addressed to the finalists.

In conclusion, the use of metaphor is one of important ways in giving evaluations to the finalists' performances in such a spectacular show. In other words, the metaphors make the utterances become more impressive, powerful, meaningful, and wonderful than when they are delivered literally.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ankersmit, F. R and J. J. A Mooij (eds). 1993. *Knowledge and Language: Metaphor and Knowledge*. Netherland: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bonvillain, Nancy. 1997. *Language, Culture, and Communication: The Meaning of Messages*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle.
- Burns, R. 2000. *Introduction to Research Methods*. London: Longman.
- Chung, Siaw – Fong. 2005. *Source Domains as Concept Domains in Metaphorical Expressions*. Volume 10 Number 4. Retrieved on September 18<sup>th</sup> 2009 from <http://cwn.ling.sinica.edu.tw/churen/2005-SourceDomains.pdf>
- Cruse, D Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Czerny, Robert. Et.al. 1977. *The Rule of Metaphor*. London: Routledge & Kegan.
- Hornby, A S. 1974. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Khudyakova, Anastasia 2007. Metaphors Following Model 'N of a N'. Volume 2 Issues 1. Retrieved on December 17<sup>th</sup> 2009 from [http://www.linguistics-journal.com/August\\_2007\\_ak.php](http://www.linguistics-journal.com/August_2007_ak.php)
- Klarer, Mario. 2004. *An Introduction to Literary Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Kochis, Bruce and Diane Gillespie. 2006. *Conceptual Metaphors as Interpretive Tools in Qualitative Research: A Re-Examination of College Students' Diversity Discussions*. Volume 11 Number 3. Retrieved on November 24<sup>th</sup> 2008 from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR11-3/kochis.pdf>
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, 1980. *Metaphor We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Larson, Mildred L. 1984. *Meaning Based Translation: A Guide to Cross Language Equivalence*. Boston: University Press of America.
- Lecch, Geoffrey. 1981. *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*. Great Britain: Richard Clay (The Clauser Press) Ltd.