Cognitive linguists do not view metaphor as a decorative and marginal device but as a tool to reflect different ways of phenomena understanding and situation embodiment. This paper seeks to comparatively analyze the source domain of building and construction in three areas of economics, politics, and health studies in English newspapers and research articles within the framework of cognitive linguistics, to determine which register has the more pervasiveness of metaphors and also to find out the similarities and differences of conceptual metaphors (CMs) in two registers and their respective areas. To this end, MIP (Metaphor Identification Procedure) was used to properly locate and identify metaphors in the corpus of a 1,529,106 words, which was extracted from online newspaper and research article journals between a three years period from the beginning of 2015 to the end of 2018. A chi-square analysis was conducted to see whether the frequency distribution of CMs in the corpus was meaningful or not. The results indicate that research articles tended to employ more metaphorical expressions of building and construction than the newspaper because of the different physical environment. Furthermore, the CMs in politics outnumber the other fields of study. The results aim at enhancing learners and teachers’ perspective toward CMs in different registers and genres.

1. INTRODUCTION

Traditional metaphor theory viewed metaphor as a literary matter, a rhetorical device, and a decoration of language, until the conceptual metaphor theory, put forward by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) has turned it to a heated topic of cognitive linguistic study. Speakers use metaphor as a cognitive tool to facilitate the understanding of the relatively unknown and abstract concepts through the more known and concrete ones. Metaphors help us to realize what kind of world we live in and shape our communicational, cultural, and psychological understanding.

The CMs have been analyzed by employing the methods of quantitative-qualitative research. McEnery and Wilson (2001) prefer the combinational use of both methods by suggesting that “Qualitative analysis can provide greater richness and precision, whereas quantitative analysis can provide greater statistically reliable and generalized results” (p. 77). Qualitative analysis provided a possibility to identify those linguistic expressions which are the embodiment of CMs and also their functions and usage in the corpus of newspaper and research article registers. Quantitative analysis enabled us to present the statistical analysis of the result. This empirical investigation enabled us to identify the frequency of CMs in the corpus.

Nowadays, economics, politics, and health issues are getting closely related to our daily life and according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) metaphors are frequently used in thought and everyday language, so we should expect that these three areas shows the abundance of metaphors. Newspaper and research article as two main registers attempt to use kind of material that is informative and can be efficiently received and perceived by readers. There is a shortage of studies on the comparative use of CMs in different registers and areas of studies. This paper tries to apply the conceptual metaphor theory in the terms of source domain of construction and building to give a detailed explanation of how this source domain is used in the registers of newspaper and research articles in three areas of economics, politics, and health studies. This study attempts to promote the explanatory power of similarities and differences existing between them.
The justification for selection of three areas can be found in this main reason that there is a close connection between these areas and people’s daily life.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Definition and Classification of Conceptual Metaphor

The term “metaphor” derives from the Greek word “metaphora” in which the constituent parts of “meta” and “phor” means “to cross” and “to carry”, respectively, so the whole word means to transfer from one thing to another. Ancient scholars regarded metaphors as a figure of speech that functions as an ornamental and artistic device.

Other scholars such as Knowles and Moon (2006), Malmkjær (2002), and Kövecses (2002) presented definitions of metaphor that are similar to those of traditional scholars, highlighting the implicit comparison between two objects. Mirowski (1994) argues against this simplistic definitions asserting that thinking and metaphor are inseparable and “it is not so much that metaphors are cognitive; rather cognition is metaphorical.”(p. 26). In line with Mirowski (1994), Borders (2011) claims that metaphor is an indispensable part of human cognition and “help us navigate the real world with a degree of efficiency that literal language can’t offer” (p. 1). Therefore, cognitive linguists believed that metaphors are not limited to language rather they reveal the way people think, so they are conceptual rather than linguistic.

Until the publication of “Metaphor We Lived By” by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), metaphor, in traditional linguistics, is considered merely as a linguistic device. These scholars in the domain of cognitive linguistics see metaphor as a conceptual phenomenon that basically relates to what happens in the mind, which structures and comprehends most of the abstract domains of our daily life. The cognitivist believes that the construction of metaphoric expressions is essentially derived from human thinking and behavior that makes it a vital figure of thought and inseparable from human cognition.

Lakoff (1993) has set his focus on a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system to understand or think of one thing in terms of something else (p. 203). Kövecses (2002) elaborates on the concept of cross-domain mapping in which the conceptual metaphor means that conceptual domain (A) is conceptual domain (B) (p. 4). Target domain refers to the conceptual domain that we try to understand it via source domain (Kövecses 2002, p. 12). Gibbs (2006) argues that source domains including physical, sensorial, and motor experiences necessarily happen before the target domains including complex and abstract experiences. Therefore, target consists of abstract ideas, while source presents concepts that are more concrete.

Murphy (1996) claims that people cannot conceptualize abstract domains like love and time without thinking about concrete domains like journeys and movements. These kinds of cross-domain mappings as an essence of conceptual metaphors derived from the experiential bases, which boosts our understanding of the abstract concepts. For example, the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR is revealed by metaphorical expression such as he attacked every weak point in my argument and His criticisms were right on target (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; p. 9).

Lakoff and Johnson classified conventional metaphors into three types: structural metaphors (one concept is structured in terms of another), orientational metaphors (two systems of concepts are structured in relation to each other), and ontological metaphors (abstract phenomena are treated as physical objects). Lakoff and Johnson (2003), in their recent work, removed the division between metaphors and maintained that all metaphors are structural and ontological and many orientational (p. 264).

2.2 The Use of CMs in Journalistic Texts and Research Articles

Biber and Conrad (2009) consider register on the same level as genre because it can be considered as discourse variety that investigates the pervasive linguistic features while in genre analysis the unique linguistic features are studied. This article aims to explore the presence of CMs in academic discourse and in the newspaper texts. We need this kind of metaphor investigation to highlight the differences and similarities across different registers and fields. The trend in most studies of metaphorical language in academic text is to present the great wealth of studies on metaphorical language use in various academic disciplines (e.g., Maassen & Weingart, 1995). The finding of these studies indicates that metaphor is ubiquitous and is the indispensable part of academic discourse. Most of the studies have rarely focused on cross-register differences and/or quantitative approaches.

The distinction between academic writing and newspaper writing can be related to the audience. The writers in academic context mainly face with a scholarly audience involved in research or intellectual inquiry. The journalist addresses common people about the subjects that are not so complicated to understand.
Newspapers generally have three main purposes that can be expressed in terms of enhancing awareness, decoration, and cohesiveness. The main function of news articles is to be informative so that a large audience could be aware of the mainstream events and facts. This function is more apparent because news articles are limited in the space allocated to them and the efficient use of information is more needed. The role of metaphor is more highlighted when it comes to the communication of complicated concepts especially in the newspapers, where efficient use of metaphors is needed to facilitate understanding of abstract matters to a large group of lay people. Therefore, metaphors act as a space saving approach, where readers understand the concepts efficiently while the complexity of linguistic expression is at the minimum level.

Another function of metaphor is to attract the attention of the reader and try to keep this interest through the use of more eye-catching metaphorical expressions especially in the headlines. The use of metaphors helps writers to avoid being neutral or objective in the description of the situations and put the matter in their desired way. In line with this view, Anderson and Nicholson (2005) maintain that “(...) although journalists typically present a news account as an ‘objective’, ‘impartial’ translation of reality, it may instead be understood to be providing an ideological construction of contending truth claims about reality” (p. 158).

Finally, metaphors are used to improve the cohesion in a text by feeding into the common theme, using the high frequencies of different CMs in a particular semantic field. This can be observed in the dominant use of one or two CMs throughout an article.

With regard to research articles, Hyland (2006) asserts that discourse communities have their own particular discourse that is manifested in the variety of lexical and conceptual expressions. It is the established conventions among communities that determine a special kind of language or discourse. Discourse communities are the result of the interaction between the experts, topics, setting, communicative purposes, and their intended audience, which determines rhetorical choices that the writers make.

2.3 Research Questions
1. Is there any significant difference between registers of newspaper and research articles in the use of CMs of building and construction in three fields of study namely, politics, economics, and health studies?
2. What conceptual metaphors are predominant within both registers of newspaper and research articles?

3. METHODOLOGY
3.1 Searching for Metaphors in the Corpus
In this study, two stages of analysis including metaphor identification and its interpretation are utilized. The Pragglejaz Group (2007) offers Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) to recognize metaphors. Semino (2008) points out that MIP is a helpful tool that provides researchers with consistent, precise, and credible method to obtain validated research findings and enable researchers not to rely on intuition in the problematic and complicated matters. Therefore, this procedure determines the metaphoricity of word in the actual context and with its occurrence in authentic ground. For Pragglejaz group (2007) the guiding principle that determines the metaphoricity of lexical items is the dissimilarity between the basic and contextual meaning.

MIP has four steps as follows:
1. Read the entire text—discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text—discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
(b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be:
— More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste];
— Related to bodily action;
— More precise (as opposed to vague);
— Historically older;
Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
(c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current—contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning and can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical. (p. 3)

The first is to determine the metaphoricity of a lexical item in the material under study. Charteris-Black (2011) in the stage of metaphor identification for finding out the connection between the lexical item and its basic sense compares the actual meaning of the word with the textual meaning. Therefore, the metaphoricity of lexical items is determined in accordance with the context in which they appear. Dictionaries provide researchers with concrete information that are not purely relying on their own intuitions as Steen (2007) asserts dictionaries are more advantageous where researchers have different
knowledge background and enable them to adopt ‘an independent reflection of what counts as the meanings of words for a particular group of users of English [or a given language]’ (p. 97). In this study both the Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners and the Oxford English Dictionary are used to check the basic meaning of a word, since the former is a corpus-based dictionary and its corpus is a relatively new one, which would be useful to the present study’s analysis of recently-used content, and the latter consists of a detailed analysis of the basic meaning of a determined lexical item with the origin of the term.

For the second stage or interpretation stage, Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) conceptual metaphor theory is utilized. This theory assumed that, according to Charteris-Black (2011), the abstract and non-physical concepts can be illuminated with concrete and physically-based human experiences. Furthermore, the study adopted Kittay and Lehrer’s (1981) semantic field theory of metaphor to establish the CMs identified in the context. A semantic field bears a certain relationship between a set of lexeme. For example, the conceptual domain of ‘color’ is associated with terms such as red, blue, green, etc. According to Kittay and Lehrer (1981), the realization of unrelated semantic fields brought together is facilitated when we refer to the previously-established semantic relationship between the lexemes to find out the new connections between fields as is the case in metaphorical language, that is, “(…) a significant portion of a lexical field is transferred from one domain to another and imposes a structure on the recipient domain” (p. 34).

Identified linguistic expressions can be interrelated to their CMs based on this systematic and definitive framework. The justification for the use of this method as discussed by Semino et al. (2004), Forceville (2006), and Gibbs (2009) is that the traditional methods are unable to present precise and authentic criteria for determining the metaphoricity of words and mainly depend on inadequate intuitive approaches and analyze the linguistic and CM in an unreal context. Therefore, because of the above-mentioned shortcoming, this research intends to adopt the MIP and the semantic field theory of metaphor as the methodological tool for the identification of metaphorical expressions and their CM. Steen (2007) maintains that although semantic fields are not quite the same as conceptual domains, they would be helpful in the creating domains of conceptual mapping as “Lexical fields can provide an initial point of entry into (…) conceptual domains” (p. 190).

3.2 The Source-Domain-Oriented Approach
Stefanowitsch (2006) presents the framework of source-domain-oriented method and its application to corpus text, which was initially implemented by Deignan (1999). In this study the research of metaphor is conducted deductively, that is, we have available source domain lexicons and then we search for them through entire text to establish their existence. The source domain of building and construction can conceptually structured by the notions of ‘floor’, ‘ceiling’, ‘foundations’ and so on. The approach would proceed by collecting the related source domain lexicons and creating the list of potential metaphors that are then qualitatively investigated to assure that they are actually used metaphorically. Steen (2007) maintains that deductive approach can be described as “particularly suited for corpus approaches as source domain lexicons from postulated CMs can easily be searched for over large stretches of discourse.”(p. 307). Therefore, individual words related to the intended source domain are chosen and then these are searched in the corpora and finally metaphorical expressions are classified under their CMs.

Based on Kövecses’ (2002) inventory of commonly-used source domains for English metaphors that includes thirteen source domains, buildings and construction is one of those significant metaphors in everyday English language. In this study, the source domain of building and construction is investigated to take account of differences and similarities between two registers and three fields of study.

The source domain of building is rooted in daily human experiences which people make use of them to understand a wide range of abstract target concepts. Therefore, the aim of this study is to investigate the conceptual mapping from the source domain of building onto the different target domains. The first step is to identify building terms that refer to the lexical items such as build, construct, floor, ceiling…The method of listing and retrieving metaphor is that we started from reading a small corpus thoroughly, searching it manually, and determining all the existing metaphors in it. We applied the findings to a larger corpus to mark the metaphors in their verbal surroundings and obtain more generalized linguistic results. Within preselected building terms that listed according to previous studies and through the reading of the beginning 3000 words in each register, 26 building terms in English newspaper, 17 terms in English research articles were found.

3.3 Materials
The material used for the current study consists of 1,529,106 words from English newspaper and journal
articles including three areas of economics, politics, and health studies (759512 words from English newspaper and 769594 from English journal). These texts are gathered from online newspaper and journals. English newspaper articles are chosen from such online newspapers as Telegraph, Daily Express, Guardian, and Daily Mail. The English economic articles are chosen from Journal of Urban Economics (JUE), Research in Economics (RE), International Review of Economics (IRE), and International Advances in Economic Research (IARR). The English politics articles are chosen from Policy Sciences (PS), Political Behavior (PB), and the British Journal of Politics and International Relations (BJPIR). The English health studies are from International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health (IJERPH), BMC Public Health (BMCPH), Journal of Urban Health (JUH). The corpus is selected in the period of 2015-2018. The extracted text was compiled in a word file, totaling around 1,529,106 words. The texts were searched based on predetermined source domains.

Besides the absolute frequency, we also calculated normalized frequencies (metaphor density) that are based on the relative numbers of metaphors, i.e. metaphor per 1000 words. This measure enables the researcher to gather the text of different length and this makes the straightforward comparison across texts. Cameron (2003) employs this normalized frequency in her study by dividing the total number of metaphors by the number of words in 1000.

### 3.4 Reliability

It is needed to avoid subjectivity and inter-rater agreement is conducted to examine the extent of agreement between annotators that determines the accuracy classification of CMs with regard to their related source domains. 300 CMs within their linguistic context are presented to two annotators to analyze metaphoricity of the sample after being trained to do the task. They are native speaker of Persian and held a graduate degree in TEFL. One annotator scored 97.3% agreement with my choices and the other scored the 95.3% The high agreement percentages indicate that there is high value of the researcher’s judgments in the classification of these 300 CMs with regard to their source domains.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis of the CMs found in the English newspaper and articles. This stage of metaphor interpretation presents the collection of linguistics realization of source domain of building and construction. A quantitative analysis of the number of lexical metaphors in the corpus is conducted. In this section, the metaphors of the analyzed text from English newspaper and English articles are presented in terms of a comparative study.

From the investigated material of four newspapers, a total number of 543 metaphors of building and construction were found in three disciplines of economics, politics, and health studies. 966 metaphors were encountered in the corpus of English research articles in the related disciplines. The conceptual domain of building and construction includes 26 subtypes of source domain in English newspaper, 17 subtypes in English article.

In order to find out the differences among economics, politics, and health study in research articles and newspaper regarding the distribution of building CMs, first, we calculated the distribution of building CMs in two registers of research articles and newspaper and in the three disciplines of economics, politics, and health study. Furthermore, the frequency of building CM was calculated per 1000 words. Table 1 presents the total number of words, the frequency of building CMs in the related registers and field of studies.

| Table 1. The Frequency of CMs of Building & Construction in English Newspaper and Research Articles |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Source Domains | English Article=17 | Total | Economics(255544) | Medicine(255213) | Politics(258836) | 769594 |
| Buildin g & Constr uction | 400 | 155 | 411 | 966 |
| Per 1000 | 1.57 | 0.61 | 1.59 | 1.26 |
| Metaph or Source Domain s | English Newspaper=26 | Total | Economics(252540) | Medicine(251490) | Politics(255477) | 759512 |
| Buildin g & Constr uction | 243 | 136 | 164 | 543 |
| Per 1000 | 0.96 | 0.54 | 0.64 | .71 |

According to the table of critical values of $\chi^2$ (Brown, 1988, p. 192), critical value of $\chi^2$ for 2 degrees of freedom at the 0.05 level is 5.99. The observed value of $\chi^2$ calculated here is 29.41 which is more than the critical value of $\chi^2$:

\[ \text{Observed } \chi^2 = 29.41 > \text{Critical } \chi^2 = 5.99 \]
Table 2. Computation of $\chi^2$ of CMs in newspaper and research articles in economics, politics, and health study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>29.414a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>29.421</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 104.71.

Figure 1. Distribution of CMs in English Newspaper and Research Articles

The result of the test indicates that differences among economics, politics, and health studies in two registers of newspaper and research articles in the use of building CMs are statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis regarding to first research question is rejected.

The findings regarding the overall distribution of building CMs revealed that the frequency of metaphors per 1,000 words in research articles (1.26) was higher than those of newspapers (0.71). The highest frequency belong to political research articles with 1.59 per 1000 words and economic research articles and economic newspaper contain the 1.57 and .96 per 1000 words, respectively. The lowest value belongs to health study newspaper with .54 per 1000 words. As evident from Figure 1, within three disciplines in newspaper register, economics include more CMs than politics and health studies. While in research article, it is politics that includes more CMs. These findings indicate that writers of research articles tend to use more building CMs in their text to convey their ideas or establish their viewpoints.

In newspaper and in the field of economy, the conceptual metaphor DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION IS BUILDING contains the highest frequency and in research articles, the conceptual metaphor CREATING THE COMPONENT OF STUDY IS BUILDING constitutes the largest number of CMs. In newspaper and in the field of politics, the conceptual metaphor (STRENGTHENING) POLITICAL POSITION IS BUILDING contains the highest frequency and in political research articles, the conceptual metaphor POLITICAL POSITION IS BUILDING constitutes the largest number of CMs. In newspaper and in the field of health studies, the conceptual metaphor PROVING HEALTH STUDY FINDING IS BUILDING contains the highest frequency and in health study research articles the conceptual metaphor STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE IS BUILDING constitutes the largest number of CMs.

These differences can be explained by resorting to object and nature of the registers. The register of research article is related to the discourse communities and their activities, as they are the result of the interaction between the experts, topics, setting, communicative purposes, and their intended audience, which determines rhetorical choices that the writers make. The writers in academic context mainly face with a scholarly audience involved in research or intellectual inquiry. The topic in academic context is more abstract and complicated and writers attempt to establish their position in the related discourse communities and make their text more concrete and simple by adopting CMs. The journalists specifically address common people about the subjects that are not so complicated to understand.

A building source domain is rather familiar to people on the basis of subjective common properties and it is also essential for people to provide shelter. According to Kovecses (2003), “Human beings build houses and other structures for shelter, work, storage, and so on”, and “(b)oth the static object of a house and its parts and the act of building it serve as common metaphorical source domains” (p. 17). Many metaphorical expressions make use of the building, structure, and construction because the abstract concepts become easy to understand for audience. Regarding the discipline or fields of study, it seems that the field of health studies that deals with human body does not contain the more abstract issues, and this fact that metaphor is more helpful in the abstract fields such as economics and politics to take account of the complexity existing in them. In summary, using the CMs and associated metaphorical expressions according to McCloskey (1995) assist writers to make abstract concepts tangible and concrete. The building
metaphors help readers to concretize the processes and issues as the building of a structure and this leads to the creating well-organized systems in the readers’ mind. The building and construction metaphors assist writers to be in control of the discussion, that is, it is human beings who decide what is going to happen because in reality we are in charge of the maintenance of the buildings.

Although English newspaper includes more types of building metaphor that amount to 23, 22, 16 in economics, politics and health studies respectively, there are higher frequencies of metaphors in English articles that contain 13,14,11 types of building metaphors in economics, politics and health studies. The different types of source domain of building in newspaper are as follows: brick, bridge, build, ceiling, cement, collapse, construct, corner, crack, door, establish, foundation, gate, house, pillar, prop, roof, stable, structure, tower, wall, and window. The different types of building source domains in research articles are as follows: architecture, bridge, build, ceiling, collapse, construct, corner, establish, foundation, pillar, ruin, stable, structure, and window.

CMs in Economic Newspaper
SUPPORT IS BUILDING
The following example illustrates that for maintaining and continuing economic activities writers make use of maintenance building metaphor to emphasize that smaller businesses rely on bigger ones to survive in economic competition. Emerging markets have been propped up by the solid performance of the technology sector. (DAILY MAIL, 2017, 9, 9)

THE FAILURE OF ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION IS BUILDING
The lexical metaphor of collapse is used to describe the organization that is unable to continue its activity because of its weak and damaged system. Its sudden failure can be envisioned in building’s falling down. The OBR’s yardstick for this was productivity growth, the amount of output per hour worked, which historically has risen by slightly more than 2% a year but which collapsed during the financial crisis. (Guardian 2018,3,15)

CURRENCY CHANGE IS BUILDING
As we know from our experiences about building and construction, the well-structured building is firm and strong. Accordingly, in economics we use these metaphors to refer to the well-established economy with low changes in currency. This facilitates the prediction in economy and enhances the investment opportunity. As global growth continues to recover, a stable US dollar and commodity backdrop ... (Daily mail, 2017, 9, 9)

CMs in Economic Research Article
CREATING THE COMPONENT OF RESEARCH STUDY IS BUILDING
The building metaphors in research articles play an important role in organizing the framework of study and its components. The researchers make use of metaphors to create clear-cut distinctions between different parts of articles to provide readers with cues for better understanding. Another CM that is closely related to this function is BESEECHERS ARE BUILDERS.

LIMIT IS BUILDING
Ceiling is metaphorically related to upper limit that is allowed by law. It implies that authorities impose a rule that should not be violated. They also estimate an alternative policy of increasing in county level price ceilings but find that this increase would accrue to landlords and result in little change in voucher recipient relocation. (JUE, 2017, 99, 48-61).

THE IMPORTANT PART OF THE STUDY IS BUILDING
Writers attempts to emphasize the importance of the topics by inferencing from the foundation of a building, so these sub-metaphors that reflect the stability of a building is mapped into the aspect of importance of the abstract concepts that one can not argue against them. The theoretical and philosophical foundations of the approach are summarized, and its empirical translation is briefly described. (IRE, 2017, 64(2), 159-178.)

CMs in Political Newspaper
(STRENGTHENING) POLITICAL POSITION IS BUILDING
The cementing as a building process is used to refer to the strengthening of an action, as cementing in political text is used to strengthen the political positions. The displacement deal will bring the campaign in eastern Ghouta, which was condemned as a “monstrous annihilation” by the UN high commissioner for human rights, closer to conclusion, and it will cement the regime’s hold on central and western Syria. (Guardian, 2018, 3, 23)

(DIS)AGREEMENT IS BUILDING
The lexical metaphor Crack implies that there are minor inconsistencies in the political systems and if
they went unnoticed, they would turn into wider gaps or severe political problems.
The budget shortfall caused by Brexit is set to deepen cracks in the EU, particularly between the position of the European Commission and some central and eastern European countries. (Express mail, 2018, 8, 16)

END OF POLITICAL PARTY IS BUILDING
The sudden disappearance of political groups that usually continue for a short time is described by lexical metaphor collapse.
While the past few months saw the collapse of ISIS’s so-called ‘caliphate’ state across the border of Syria and Iraq, there are several other groups - terrorist and non-terrorist - looking to carve out a place of their own across the country. (Guardian, 2018, 3, 14)

SUPPORTING IS BUILDING
Supporting in political text usually accompanied with the lexical metaphor build that refer to systematic formation of political support. Constructive support in the following example refers to this fact that it is helpful and producing good results.
While the United States’ participation in international forums - including the Paris accord and the Arctic Council - has been reported, its continued, broad and constructive support for climate change efforts in these gatherings has not. (Daily Mail, 2018, 3, 15)

CMs in Health Study Newspaper
POLITICAL SYSTEM IS BUILDING
The metaphors of building and its parts can be used to facilitate the understanding the abstract concepts such as politics. Furthermore, it can emphasize the subjects or the importance of political organization by using lexical metaphor pillar. The use of structure for political systems make them more manageable and under control.
If this were to occur, then even the NATO pillar of the Atlantic order could be undermined. (BJPIR, 2017, 19(3), 558-572).

PROVING RESEARCH IS BUILDING
Researchers resort to building metaphors to strengthen their discussion and this would lead them to have a well-structured research paper.
To establish the plausibility of that model, a worked example will be helpful. Of course, it will only be an example—a ‘proof of concept,’ no more. (PS, 2017, 50(3), 351-366).

POLITICAL POLICY IS BUILDING
Throughout the political text, political policies play an important role in political agreement; therefore, the researchers consider it as a structure to deal with different aspects of policy.
We used this multi-method, integrative approach to collect data on ordinary scientific and management issues ..., social and decision-making processes ..., and the structure of the constitutive policy process pertaining to elk management ... (PS, 2017, 50(2), 295-316).

CMs in Health Study Research Article
HEALTH THREAT IS BUILDING
This CM is related to those health problems that increase over time and functions as sort of warning to prevent the incoming problems. The gradual increasing of harmful health problems such as fat, calories, and plague is usually illustrated by the lexical metaphors of buildup.
Dr Harris said their actions in the body are not just linked with one pathological process, such as a buildup of plaque in the arteries. (Daily Mail, 2018, 3, 16)

SOLUTION IS BUILDING
Gap used in studies unusually refer to a missing part or difference between two things, which prevents it from being a complete thing. Bridging a gap is kind of finding solutions and its frequent use in research studies connects previous and present studies by presenting answers.
I want to bridge a gap for people who have come out of treatment, or who are waiting for long periods of time for an appointment ... (Telegraph, 2018, 4, 1)

BODY MALFUNCTION IS BUILDING
As it was discussed before, the building metaphor is used to describe the function of body and its organs. When the body organs are weak and are on the verge of nonfunctioning, the lexical metaphor collapse is used to help readers envision body organs as structures that have collapsed, organs will fail and will quickly die. (Daily Mail, 2017, 9, 18)

PHYSICAL HEALTH CONDITION IS BUILDING
Stable in health studies is utilized to describe health conditions that are not easily exposed to health problems or threat.
Keeping this temperature stable is one of the secrets of our body’s ability to survive in different climates all around the world. (Daily Mail, 2017, 9, 18)

CMs in Health Study Research Article
VARIABLE OF THE STUDY IS BUILDING
It is customary in research studies to use the building metaphor construct to bolster the attitude that the research articles are building and researchers are builders. Constructs are ideas and thoughts created by combining several pieces of information.
Crowding is a complex construct to quantify in cross-cultural contexts [50] and is measured disparately in existing Aboriginal health studies [25, 36, 47]. (BMCPH, 2018, 18(1), 70).

RESEARCH STUDY IS BUILDING
The use of building CMs enables researchers to manipulate the variables and constructs like building blocks to reach their intended meaning.
To assess secondhand smoke exposure, the categories of often and sometimes were collapsed and compared to never. (JUH, 2017, 94:534–541)

ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGES IS BUILDING
Introducing changes and flexibilities in research activities can be described by opening the door. The use of these CMs implies that discourse communities have welcomed new changes and innovations. These codes might become even more potent avenues for homelessness-related disaster surveillance, in addition to opening doors to new research and service provision opportunities to better understand and serve the significant number of ED patients who are homeless. (JUH, 2016, 93(2), 331-344).

5. CONCLUSION
The CMs derived from the source domain of building & constructions convey both the positive and negative evaluation throughout the research articles and newspaper. On the one hand, they can refer to the firm foundation of an activity or the stable framework of processes that can result from the good planning and performance. On the other hand, they could refer to the weakness in the systems as a result of malfunction or lack of proper management and they have to suffer the consequence. This metaphor enables the writers to see themselves as architect or builders who have a well-structured plan to build up new ideas to convince readers and convey their intended attitudes towards issues and draw the reader’s attention to the points they want.

The more frequent use of CMs in politics and in economics put emphasis on this point that they are discursive devices for building various views and ideas and thereby ‘crea[ing] social reality and guid[ing] social action’ (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 156). Modern world is changing quickly and in order to keep up with the pace especially in the abstract fields of studies such as politics and economics, we need to use CMs to facilitate the understanding of the material and formation of attitudes and viewpoints. Research articles make the most use of lexical metaphors of building and construction to enhance the structural and conceptual organization of knowledge that is incrementally progresses through sharing ideas in the discourse communities. Building metaphors help researchers to illustrate the foundation of their work, it systematically conducted procedures and its success or failure. Allbritton (1995) maintains that science can benefit from metaphorical “scaffolds” in familiar source domains to offer a coherent schema for understanding abstract concepts. Because of disciplinary differences that result from their degree of abstractedness, health study in both registers has the least frequent of CMs as it is more concrete than economics and politics.
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