Military Affair and Building as Source Domains in Nominating Strategic Management Terminology

Nguyen Thi Thuy Hanh

Thuongmai University, Hanoi, Vietnam

Our understanding of abstract concepts is heavily influenced by metaphors, which is part of the human conceptual system. The Theory of Conceptual Metaphor provides linguistic evidence that metaphor is the subject of not only artistic discourses but terminology nomination as well. The present study attempts to apply the conceptual metaphor theory to investigate the use of military affair and building source domains in nominating strategic management terminology. The corpus comprises 360 metaphorical terms collected from strategic management dictionaries and books. Based on the experiential correlations and knowledge mapped from source domains onto the target domain, the study has grouped these metaphorical terms in two primary metaphors STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS A MILITARY AFFAIR and STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS BUILDING, entailing multiple derivative metaphors in strategic management term nomination. It is discovered in the present study that the attributes from military affair, namely military forces, battlefield, military operations, military strategies, battle results are mapped onto aspects of the target domain, thus nominate terms denoting companies, market, business activities, business strategies and business results respectively. The study also reveals that companies are metaphorically viewed as buildings, while strategic management process is conceptualized as building process. It is expected that the findings of the study will help strategists, researchers, learners, practitioners and teachers gain useful insight into the metaphorical nomination of strategic management terminology. Avenues for future research on conceptual metaphors in strategic management are then proposed.

Keywords: *metaphorical term; metaphorical nomination; strategic management term; military affair domain; building domain*

1 Introduction

Metaphors are an integral and significant component of human communication that have a profound effect on how we shape our thoughts and perceive the world (Ptiˇcek & Dobša 2023), create specific perspectives, serve as crucial framing devices (Zeng & Ahrens 2023), bridge the gap between the abstract concepts and the concrete world, enabling effective communication and understanding (Paul et al. 2024). In this respect, metaphor helps to explain abstract phenomena and concepts in a more familiar and concrete way (Lakoff & Johnson 2003; Kövecses 2010). Rather than just as a stylistic or artistic device, metaphor is primarily employed to nominate and generate new meanings in developing terminological units (Sherizatova 2019; Khachmafova et al. 2021; Bogdanović 2023). Consequently, metaphor has been established and extensively examined as one of the tools experts deploy to explain, simplify and transform complex scientific discourse into information that non-experts can understand (Silaški & Đurović 2024) and metaphorization provides a productive semantic source for the formation of terminology (Sherizatova 2019; Celiešienė & Juzelėnienė 2019).

The study of a specialized language, which requires understanding processes and mechanisms of terms' formation and development (Alekseeva et al. 2020), is undergoing a cognitive shift, which is conducive to a greater emphasis on meaning as well as conceptual

structures (Faber 2012). As such, efforts have been undertaken to more insight into the interrelatedness of metaphorizations that occur in the language of a specific domain of experience, i.e. to trace metaphorical cognitive models (Lakoff & Johnson 2003; Kövecses 2010; Sherizatova 2019; Alekseeva et al. 2020; Ptiˇcek & Dobša 2023, to name but a few). It is widely acknowledged that the primary models for term formation through metaphorization may base on the similarities of functions, forms or the internal structure of the called object or phenomenon, as well as associative transfer of features (Celiešienė & Juzelėnienė 2019; Khachmafova et al. 2021; Zibin et al. 2024). As a result, numerous studies conducted by different scholars have uncovered a variety of cognitive models to better explain and enhance the process of term-nomination considering its specific characteristics. War/ military affair, journey, plant, building, food, etc. are commonly utilized to create new terms.

A considerable literature of empirical and theoretical research on the use of military and building metaphors in natural language and experimental contexts presents these metaphors as dynamic figures of speech with different communicative purposes. War metaphor was first investigated in the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR (Lakoff & Johnson 2003). This work has paved the way for a number of similar investigations on the mapping from source domain of war/ military affair onto a great variety of target domains including politics (Seixas 2021; Mujagić 2024), public discourse (Flusberg et al. 2018; Zeng & Ahrens 2023), sports (Nguyen et al. 2022), business (Wiliński 2017; Shehab & Nazzal 2022), maritime news (Xu et al. 2023), etc. in which certain attributes of war like armies, army leaders, weapons, battlefield, war objectives, tactics in battle are projected onto similar aspects of the target domain. Similarly, the source domain of building has been examined in various metaphors, for instance AN ARGUMENT IS A BUILDING and THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS (Lakoff & Johnson 2003), COMPLEX SYSTEMS ARE BUILDINGS (Kövecses 2010), A COUNTRY IS A BUILDING (Lu et al. 2008) in which expressions in the source domain of a building are used to talk about the corresponding concepts in the target domain of an argument, theories, complex systems, a country and so on.

A review on literature has made it clear that existing studies on military affair and building have discovered with a great variety of cognitive models as well as attributes projected from these domains onto different target domains. However, little attention has been paid on the conceptual models of strategic management terminology from these source domains. Thus, the present paper attempts to fill this significant gap in the literature by drawing on the results of the metaphorical transfer of the understanding of information coded in military affair and building source domains to the new understanding and naming of strategic management terminology. In order to fulfill the aim of the study, the following three research questions are addressed:

1. What are the mapping principles between military affair source domain and target domain of strategic management?
2. What are the mapping principles between building source domain and target domain of strategic management?
3. How frequent are strategic management terms metaphorically nominated from these two source domains?

2 Theoretical framework

In this section, we first outline the theory of conceptual metaphor which is the basic theoretical framework for analysis in this study. The conceptual mapping principles, source domain and target domain are also discussed in this section. We then briefly present some research on conceptual metaphor in term nomination, and strategic management terminology.

2.1 *The Theory of Conceptual Metaphor*

It was once believed that metaphors could only be employed in literature (Malik 2023). However, a unique explanation of metaphor by Lakoff & Johnson has completely altered our understanding of metaphors by introducing the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the central claim of which is that people conceptualize a great deal of abstract domains metaphorically in terms of more concrete or well-understood domains (Lakoff 1993; Lakoff & Johnson 2003). The concept of metaphor is further defined by Kövecses, who claimed conceptual metaphor to be a systematic set of correspondences, or *mapping*, between two experience domains. Conceptual metaphor means that conceptual domain (A) is conceptual domain (B) in the sense that the basic conceptual components of B match the basic components of A (Kövecses 2010; Kövecses 2015).

Through the use of metaphors to bridge the gap between two objects or realities, we can better understand one another. All of them have deeper and more profound meanings now that they are associated metaphorically (Xie 2023). In other words, metaphors are commonly used to express unfamiliar abstract concepts based on life experience (Zhu et al. 2023). People will talk about target domains like life, love, ideas, argument, social organization, business, etc. by means of using journey, war, building, food and plants as their source domains. Beside describing pre-existing similarities between concepts, metaphors also facilitate the creation of new connections and understandings between concepts (Lakoff & Johnson 2003). To put the same thing differently, metaphors have the potential to influence our cognitive processes and disclose relationships that may have previously been overlooked. This has significant implications for our comprehension of language, cognition, and even culture.

2.2 *Basic mapping principles for conceptual metaphor*

Metaphors, according to the cognitive linguistic perspective, are collections of conventional mappings between a more concrete or physical source domain and a more abstract target domain (Lakoff & Johnson 2003; Kövecses 2010; Borys 2023). The set of mappings obtains between fundamental constituent elements of the source domain and fundamental constituent elements of the target which can be characterized by the formula TARGET-DOMAIN IS SOURCE-DOMAIN. For example, in Lakoff & Johnson's (2003) LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, a set of conceptual correspondences from the source domain JOURNEY (e.g. the travelers, the destination, the trip, etc.) are systematically mapped onto the target domain LOVE, i.e. the lovers, the goals of the relationship, the relationship, etc.

One feature of conceptual metaphor is its *asymmetry*, i.e., its unidirectionality (Ptiˇcek & Dobša 2023). Take the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY as an example, we can see that the experience of *journey* can be used to express *love*, but we will not explain *journey* by means of *love*'s experience. The same applies to ARGUMENT IS WAR, in which we don't talk about *war* with the lens of *argument*.

Another characteristic of conceptual metaphor is that metaphorical mappings from a source to a target are only *partial* (Lakoff & Johnson 2003; Kövecses 2010). Concepts in general are defined by a number of unique features, including the source and target (Borys 2023). However, a target's attributes are partially (but not entirely) highlighted when a source domain is applied to it. This means that when a concept has several aspects and the metaphor only focuses on some aspects, the other aspects of the concept will remain hidden, that is, out of focus. *Highlighting* and *hiding* presuppose each other (Kövecses 2010). Nonetheless, given that metaphors map and highlight only particular characteristics of the source, while reducing or hiding others, they also possess a strong persuasive power (Silaški 2009). In addition, conceptual metaphor has other distinctive features including *systematic, hierarchical, universal, cultural variations* and *cultural coherence.*

2.3 *Source domains and target domains*

The mapping of one domain (*source domain*) to another (*target domain*) is the fundamental idea of the conceptual metaphor. The source domain is the conceptual domain from which we derive metaphorical expressions to comprehend another conceptual domain, whereas target domain is the domain that is understood by the utilization of the source domain (Kövecses 2010: 4). Based on our experience, the source domain represents a more concrete and well-understood concept, mapping it to a more abstract target domain, therefore make the target domain easier to understand (Bogdanović 2023). For example, in the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. the source domain is *war* and the target domain is *argument*. This mapping is not done randomly, but adheres to the principles of coherence and systematicity. Understanding more abstract realms is logically and naturally based on our experiences with the physical world (Gibbs 2008; Khachmafova et al. 2021; Zhu et al. 2023). This explains why the source and target domains are typically not reversible in common metaphors (Kövecses 2010). Given the extensive everyday knowledge we have about concrete source domains such as wars, buildings, journeys, food, containers, and so on and their constituents, we can carry that knowledge over to such targets as argument, business, love, social organizations, feelings, etc.

Human beings build houses and other structures for shelter, work, storage, and so on. Both the static object of a house and its parts and the act of building it serve as common metaphorical source domains (Kövecses 2010). That explains why building is a common concrete source domain used to explain abstract concepts. In the same way, war metaphors are ubiquitous because (a) they rely on fundamental and commonly accepted schematic knowledge that effectively structures our capacity for reasoning and discourse about a wide range of situations, and (b) They consistently convey an urgent, challenging emotional tone that draws attention and inspires action (Flusberg et al. 2018).

2.4 *Conceptual metaphor in Terminology*

Metaphor is seen to be a significant method for creating new words (Celiešienė & Juzelėnienė 2019; Sherizatova 2019; Alekseeva et al. 2020; Khachmafova et al. 2021; Nguyen 2024). Their power stems from their capacity to simultaneously appeal to the listener's multiple senses, allowing them to depict and capture real-world experiences. Additionally, they can help in conveying large amounts of information in a concise way (Gkalitsiou & Kotsopoulos 2023). Therefore, understanding the role of metaphorical interpretations in term nomination enhances

our understanding of language and the cognitive processes involved in meaning creation (Zibin et al. 2024).

The study of metaphorization in terminology nomination has become increasingly relevant and significant in recent years. Researchers have created a variety of models to better explain and enhance the process of term-nomination considering its particular characteristics. Celiešienė & Juzelėnienė (2019) examine metaphorical terms used in information technology terms and realized that certain objects or names from vegetation or animal world are frequently designated metaphorically in this terminology. While it is found in Stunžinas's study (2006) that construction terminology uses a metaphorical nomenclature to nominate attributes based on the characteristics of household items and wildlife items. In addition, Khachmafova et al. (2021) discover a number of cognitive source domains of metaphorical terms of the oil-and-gas field such as the world of human beings, animals, spatial orientation, plants and insects, sea, natural and physical phenomena, colors and shades, weapons, etc. Meanwhile, in Sherizatova's study (2019), the author conclude that metaphorical terms in medicine are created via source domains such as: household metaphors, geographical metaphors, zoomorphic metaphors, floristic metaphors, anthropomorphic metaphors, geometric metaphors, and color naming. These findings highlight the role of conceptual metaphor as an important source of term nomination.

2.5 *Strategic management terminology*

The term "strategy," which is now widely used, initially emerged in military affairs at the beginning of the 19th century in Europe. Eventually the term became so detached from its military origins to be applied to all fields of human endeavor from sports to business (Freedman 2015). Indeed, the fundamental principles of military strategy, as outlined in Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* translated by Father Joseph Amiot, frequently serves as the basis for the concepts of strategic management (Audebrand 2010). In business, strategic management is crucial since it enables an organization to identify areas for operational development. Strategic management can be defined as the art and science of formulating, implementing, and evaluating cross-functional decisions that enable an organization to achieve its objectives (David et al. 2020). Strategic management, as defined, is concerned with achieving organizational performance through the integration of management, marketing, finance/accounting, research and development, production/operations, and information systems. Stated differently, strategic management can be perceived as a combination of strategy formulation, implementation and evaluation (Bowman et al. 2002; David et al. 2020). Grant (2002) additionally argues that strategic management involves a complex relationship between the organizational focus, the outcomes obtained, and a wide range of external and internal environmental variables.

It has only been a few decades since strategic management terminology has been closely examined. Given that a term is a lexical unit made up of one or more words that expresses a concept inside a certain domain (Ciobanu 1997; Kageura 2002), we can assume that *strategic management terms are words or phrases (or multi-word expressions) which have specific meanings in the contexts of strategic management field*. The development of new terminologies is crucial to the advancement of strategic management.

3 Methodology

3.1 *Research design*

The study aims to demonstrate the use of conceptual metaphors as a means of nominating abstract notions in strategic management. Therefore, the qualitative content analysis approach is applied in the study to analyze the mappings between conceptual metaphors (source domain) and strategic management concepts (target domain), adhering to the guiding principles of metaphorical formula proposed by the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which is TARGET-DOMAIN IS SOURCE-DOMAIN. Besides, the study also utilizes statistical and classification methods to fulfill the defined research objectives. Additionally, the study's analytical approach made use of the *lexical approach* to the analysis of strategic management metaphors. As mentioned in Kövecses et al. (2024), this approach works with conventionalized expressions related to the concept under analysis, which can be typically found in dictionaries or collections of words or phrases related to strategic management concept.

      The first phrase will deal with identifying metaphorical terms, then classifying them into categories or subcategories according to different features of the military affair and building source domains and the target domain of strategic management, followed by the discussion of mapping schemes. A statistical technique will be carried out to show the frequency of the metaphorical terms in terms of source domains and their attributes to be mapped onto strategic management terminology.

3.2 *Research corpus*

The corpus was selected following the purposeful sampling technique. The material consists of a corpus composed of 360 metaphorical terms denoting strategic management aspects including 81 words and 279 phrases. In order to avoid ambiguity and intuitive judgments while assessing the basic meaning of terms, the research utilized several dictionaries to acquire the corpus for analysis, specifically "*Dictionary of Strategy: Strategic Management A-Z*" (Kelly & Booth 2004), "*A Dictionary of Strategic Management*" (Prasad 2004), "*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*" (Hornby 2015), "*Cambridge Business English Dictionary*" (Combley 2011). Nevertheless, these dictionaries still contain a relatively small number of metaphorical terms, which does not adequately capture emerging terms in strategic management. Thus, the present study gathers more data from other strategic management books *Strategic Management: Text and Cases* (Dess et al. 2021), *Strategic management: A Competitive Advantage Approach, Concepts and Cases* (David et al. 2020). The explanations of certain terms are derived from websites like Wikipedia and Investopedia. The definition of strategic management concepts was based on the following sources: (1) David et al. (2020), and (2) Grant (2002), which were used as the criteria to judge features in these concepts.

      It is important to note that no previous research has been done from this specific standpoint on the chosen corpus.

3.3 *Metaphor Identification Procedure*

Regarding metaphor identification in the selected corpus, we use the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) developed by Pragglejaz group (2007) with the following adaptive steps: (1) identify terms with potential metaphorical nomination; (2) determine metaphorical words and

phrases, mapping onto domains to identify source domains and target domains; (3) naming *metaphorical terms* - those that consist of one or more *metaphorical elements* (or metaphorically-expressed elements). The contextual meaning employed in the study is the minimal context, that is, the contextual meaning derives from the terms used in strategic management field. The study adheres to cognitive linguistics norms by using small capitals for the statement of conceptual metaphors, italics for metaphorical terms, and bold italics for metaphorical elements. A wide range of metaphorical terms in strategic management consist of one metaphorical element like "power", "structure", "health" in *pricing **power**, organizational **structure**, brand **health***, whereas there exists a lower number of strategic management terms such as ***takeover tactic**, **competitive strategy*** in which all term elements are metaphorical.

4 Findings and discussion

4.1 *The military affair source domain in strategic management terminology*

As noted earlier, the term *strategy* was originally used to comprehend military affairs at the beginning of the 19th century. The vast amount of rich knowledge about the military affair source and its constituent elements helps people in the comprehension of the strategic management field. Consequently, the notion of war is such a good and natural source domain for the target concept of strategic management. The source domain of military affair is similar to the war domain introduced by Lakoff & Johnson (2003), yet due to the historical origin of the term "strategy" this study labels the source domain as military affair. Apparently, then, the STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS A MILITARY AFFAIR metaphor utilizes most of the metaphorical entailment potential associated with the concept of war, which can be visualized through the mapping scheme between source domain and target domain in Table 1.

Table 1: Mapping schema of the metaphor STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS A MILITARY AFFAIR

Source domain's attributes (*Military affair*)		Target domain's attributes (*Strategic management*)
Military forces	➡	Companies
Battlefield	➡	Market
Military operations	➡	Business activities
Military strategy	➡	Business strategy
Battle result	➡	Business result

As presented in Table 1, through mapping scheme, the attributes from the source domain MILITARY AFFAIR are activated and mapped onto the target domain STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT, causing the target domain to bear a variety of properties of the source domain. This demonstrates the appearance of five derivative metaphors in strategic management such as COMPANIES ARE MILITARY FORCES, MARKET IS BATTLEFIELD, BUSINESS ACTIVITIES ARE MILITARY OPERATIONS, BUSINESS STRATEGY IS MILITARY STRATEGY, and BUSINESS RESULTS ARE BATTLE RESULTS. Let us now have a closer look at the mapping scheme of these metaphors.

4.1.1 Conceptual metaphor COMPANIES ARE MILITARY FORCES

The correspondences or mappings of the conceptual metaphor, companies are military forces, refers to opposing parties battling with each other for expansion or defense of their own positions. What evokes this metaphor is the fact that leaders of the company (*chief executive officer, chief finance officer, chief strategy officer*, etc.) are perceived as battle commanders or officers who lead the army in the war; the personnel in a company (*sales force, workforce*) are also considered as military force. In addition, the stakeholders like *acquirer, category killer, killer bee, tactical supplier, strategic alliance*, etc. are often identified as parties participating in the war. Another piece of evidence for the view is that the relationship among warring parties is mapped onto the relationship among companies. Therefore, adjectives countervailing, hostile or cooperative … are used to describe the features of external stakeholders such as in the terms *countervailing company, hostile bidder*. Also, it is worth mentioning that we comprehend the strength of the company and talk about it by means of the strength of the warrior. The words like strength, weakness, health or power are used to characterize the strength of the warrior. Interestingly, these attributes are activated and mapped onto the strategic management domain to describe the strength of the company.

Good examples for this mapping scheme are metaphorical terms such as *brand health, internal core strength, brand strength, organizational weakness, internal weakness, bargaining power, market power, negotiating power, monopoly power, pricing power.* One evidence for this sub-metaphor is that in the first phase of the strategic management process, companies need to carry out environmental scanning, in which they have to analyze the internal factors (*strengths* and *weaknesses*) and external factors (opportunities and threats) influencing them. Many of the above-mentioned metaphorical terms are used to describe this procedure.

The metaphorical conceptualization of companies in terms of military forces is reflected in the following examples. The basic meaning of the word *officer* is a person who is in a position of authority in the armed forces (Hornby 2015). *Officer* is used in the term **chief executive officer** to denote the main person responsible for managing a company or organization, who is sometimes also the company's president or chairman of the board (Combley 2011); *Market power* refers to the ability of a company to control prices in a particular industry (Combley 2011); *strategic alliance* is used in strategic management to indicate the agreement between two or more organizations to cooperate in specific business arrangements to gain competitive advantage (Kelly & Booth 2004); *strategic partner* is defined as a company or organization that has an arrangement to work with or help another, so that it is easier for each one of them to achieve the things they want to achieve (Combley 2011). These metaphorical terms can be taken to be fairly representative of COMPANIES ARE MILITARY FORCES metaphor; they appear to be highly conventionalized and widely used. Companies, similar to military forces that aim to maximize their power and influence, must expand their territory, whether through market share, consumer bases, or geographical reach. Effective companies are those with a strong, centralized leadership structure, in which authority is concentrated at the top. In the same way that military forces are dependent on the authority of commanding officers, companies are recognized as relying on decisive leaders who can develop and implement strategies.

4.1.2 Conceptual metaphor MARKET IS BATTLEFIELD

Let us now look at cases where elements of the battlefield are mapped onto elements of the market. A large number of the abstract target concepts of business market are characterized by

the more concrete source concept of a battlefield. The companies are considered as armies in a battlefield in that the business competition (*price **war**, trade **war**, **competition**-based pricing*, etc.) is a fight among companies (***rival** firm*, ***target** firm*, etc.) competing with others in order to achieve their business objectives like taking over the rival company or gaining market share, which can be illustrated by the metaphorical term like ***target** market*. Additionally, the characteristics of a market is metaphorically viewed as characteristics of battlefields in that the rivalry between businesses is intense. Furthermore, business competition is conceptualized as a battle between the warring parties. The market can be described by using some expressions related to battlefield in that these war terms can well reflect the intensity of competition in the business market.

Let us now see some representative examples for each of these. The term *price **competition*** is understood as the situation in which companies try to sell their products or services at lower prices than similar products or services sold by other companies (Combley 2011). *Trade **war*** is not a physical war or fight but described as a situation in which two or more countries raise import taxes and quotas (= limits on numbers of goods) to try to protect their own economies. This arises from the fact that thinking about the abstract concept of a business market is facilitated by the more concrete concept of a battlefield (Combley 2011).

When we refer to the market as a "battlefield," we portray the economic environment as a site of intense conflict, strategic positioning, and survival. This metaphor reflects a cultural understanding that markets are inherently competitive and that companies must employ aggressive strategies to secure their fair share of resources. The metaphor also influences our perspectives on the objectives of market participants, power dynamics, collaboration, and competition.

4.1.3 *Conceptual metaphor BUSINESS ACTIVITIES ARE MILITARY OPERATIONS*

A large number of business activity concepts are characterized by the source concept of military operations. When mapping this attribute onto the target domain, a number of metaphorical expressions view business activities as military operations. We possess a great amount of rich knowledge concerning a series of military operations like attack, defense, fight, takeover, compete, protect, *blockade*, conflict, target in the battlefield. These elements are utilized to nominate strategic management terms to denote business activities such as ***antitakeover defense***, *white knight **defense***, *Proxy **fight***, ***hostile takeover***, *backflip **takeover***, *corporate **takeover***. This is not a physical fight, attack, or defense but the activities that companies carry out in the market. Companies compete fiercely in the commercial world, often engaging in violent conflict to gain control of marketplaces.

Here are a few examples to illustrate the parallel between business activities and military operations. ***Hostile takeover*** is described as an acquisition that the acquired firm resists (Kelly & Booth 2004). In other words, hostile takeover bid is the attempted acquisition of a target company, but one that takes place without the consent of the target company's board of directors. A *backflip **takeover*** is used when an acquirer becomes a subsidiary of the company it purchased. Upon completion of the deal, the two entities join forces and retain the name of the company that was bought (Investopedia).

The metaphorization of terms denoting business activities mapped from the military operations contributes to our collective comprehension of business operations, what makes them successful, and how they should approach their goals and challenges. In the same way as military operations, businesses must continuously evaluate the market landscape, anticipate

competitors' actions, increase their market share, defeat their competitors, defend their position, or seize opportunities before their competitor does.

4.1.4 *Conceptual metaphor BUSINESS STRATEGY IS MILITARY STRATEGY*
The historical origin of strategy as a salient part in military affair lays scholars, strategists employ this way of understanding business strategies. Military strategies or tactics like attack strategy, defensive tactic, takeover tactic, etc. are often employed by leaders of armies to strengthen or defense their own market position, attack others' positions, or take over another army force. Sometimes they have to give up and adopt a different tactic or even redraw the battle lines if they find a position indefensible. Mapped from the source domain of military affairs, these military strategies are applied to a set of strategies employed by strategists or managers of companies in order to gain competitive advantages, expand their market share, increase profits, acquire a target company, or to achieve their better organizational performance. There are many metaphorical terms commonly used in strategic management field in which we witness the mappings of the above-mentioned source and target domains such as ***attack strategy***, *red ocean **strategy**, pricing **strategy**, concentration **strategy**, cost focus **strategy**, customer **acquisition strategy**, **defensive strategy**, downsizing **strategy**, **survival strategy**, Judo business **strategy**, late-entry **strategy**, **strategic** move, **strategic** competence, marketing **tactic**, **defensive tactic**, **tactical** move, **takeover tactic***.

The mapping of military strategy onto business strategy is illustrated in the following examples: the term "tactic" refers to the art of moving soldiers and military equipment around during a battle or war in order to use them in the most effective way (Hornby 2015), "defense tactic" is used in military to denote the art of organizing and employing armed forces to defense the army or defense the territory. In strategic management, ***defense tactic*** is defined as maneuvers a business uses in combat with its rivals to address threats and help ensure that a firm's broader strategy is carried out successfully. ***Defensive tactics*** protect the status quo or react to events as they unfold (Kelly & Booth 2004).

As we all know, military strategy is distinguished by meticulous planning and deliberative action. The mapping of military strategy attributes onto business strategy reflects in business strategy through metaphors that emphasize deliberate, calculated decisions on tactical implementation and formulation. The metaphor underscores the necessity of intentional and structured strategy throughout the strategic management process from formulation to implementation. In order to remain competitive, companies must be prepared to adapt their strategies in accordance with unpredictable markets.

4.1.5 *Conceptual metaphor BUSINESS RESULTS ARE BATTLE RESULTS*
While the purpose of a war is to defeat the enemy, the objective of a business competition between two or more rivals is to achieve a competitive edge or triumph so as to gain market share and become market leader. Similar to how a battle ends, the result of a business competition is either winning or losing the market. The description of the concept of battle results such as win, lose, defeat, surrender, dominate helps us understand the concept of business results. The attributes of battle results are mapped onto business results in such metaphorical terms as ***win, dominate, defeat, win-lose strategy**, win-win cooperation, **win-win** outcome*, ***win-lose** negotiation,* etc.

Here are some examples to illustrate this. The result of almost all two-party negotiations can be categorized as *win-win* (wherein both sides benefit), *win-lose* (when one side gains at the loss of the other), or *lose-lose* (whereby both sides end up in a worse situation). In the event

that no deal is achieved during the negotiation, leaving the parties to look for other options. The nomination of terms denoting business results through the mapping from battle results shape our collective understanding of business outcomes which are often interpreted as victories or defeats in a competitive arena.

In light of such mapping schemes, it seems that scholars and strategists make extensive use of the domain of military affair to think about the highly abstract and elusive concept of strategic management. The frequency of metaphorical elements in derivative metaphors belonging to the conceptual model STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS A MILITARY AFFAIR can be observed in Table 2.

Table 2: Metaphorical elements activated in the conceptual model STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS A MILITARY AFFAIR

Derivative metaphors	Metaphorical element	Number of terms	Frequency (%)	Metaphorical element	Number of terms	Frequency (%)
COMPANIES ARE MILITARY FORCES	alliance	2	0.90	fighter	1	0.45
	rival	3	1.36	knight	5	2.26
	force	6	2.71	strategist	2	0.90
	killer	2	0.90	partner	1	0.45
	acquirer	1	0.45	power	11	4.98
	strength	5	2.26	health	1	0.45
	weakness	2	0.90	hostile	3	1.36
	officer	13	5.88	countervailing	1	0.45
	Total	*59*	*26.70*			
MARKET IS BATTLEFIELD	competitive	5	2.26	initiative	1	0.45
	offensive	2	0.90	survival	1	0.45
	competition	3	1.36	threaten	1	0.45
	defensive	3	1.36	front	1	0.45
	war	2	0.90	division	1	0.45
	campaign	2	0.90	nonrival	1	0.45
	aggressive	1	0.45	partnering	1	0.45
	Total	*25*	*11.31*			
BUSINESS ACTIVITIES ARE MILITARY OPERATIONS	attack	2	0.90	aim	1	0.45
	defense	12	5.43	target	2	0.90
	threat	2	0.90	conflict	1	0.45
	fight	1	0.45	recruit	1	0.45
	takeover	6	2.71	launch	2	0.90
	acquire	1	0.45	kill	1	0.45
	protect	1	0.45	operation	2	0.90
	protection	1	0.45	blockade	1	0.45
	Total	*37*	*16.74*			
BUSINESS STRATEGY IS MILITARY STRATEGY	strategy	66	29.86	tactic	4	1.81
	strategic	21	9.50	tactical	2	0.90
	Total	*93*	*42.08*			
	win	3	1.36	defeat	1	0.45

BUSINESS RESULTS ARE BATTLE RESULTS	lose	1	0.45	surrender	1	0.45
	dominate	1	0.45			
	Total	*7*	*3.17*			
Total		**221**	**100**			

The compiled corpus demonstrates how frequently the military domain is used to nominate strategic management terms. Overall, it can be clearly seen from Table 2 that the metaphorical elements most commonly employed in strategic management terms are associated with the attribute "military strategy" with 93 terms, accounting for 42.08%, whereas the opposite is true for "battle result", with only 7 metaphorical terms, making up only 3.17%. The most outstanding aspect also lies in "military strategy" attribute, as the word "strategy" or its derivative "strategic" is utilized in strategic management vocabulary with the highest frequency, which appear in 66 terms, making up 29.86%. This result is consistent with primary aims of the strategic management process, encompassing strategy formulation, implementation and evaluation, which means companies may apply various strategies in order to achieve their business objectives. The attribute of "military forces" takes the second place which helps to create 59 terms, constituting 26.70% of total strategic management vocabulary designated from military affair. Other aspects of military affair discovered to be utilized extensively in strategic management terminology are military operations and battlefield, which nominate 37 and 25 metaphorical terms, comprising 16.74% and 11.31% respectively.

In light of the discussion so far, it is concluded that in strategic management terminology, the source domain of military affair generates a variety of metaphorical terms helping to enrich strategic management vocabulary and make abstract concepts become more concrete and easier to understand.

4.2 *The building source domain in strategic management terminology*

Building is the one of ancient human activity that originated purely from a functional need of shelter, work, storage, and so on, thus, the concept of building activities is a source domain that is specific, logical, understandable and familiar to each person's subconscious. As a result, building is a common source domain which helps to effectively express the concept of inherently abstract concepts, including strategic management activities. The present study has identified the STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS BUILDING metaphor, in which certain attributes of building are activated and projected to the attributes of strategic management activities. The constituent mappings of this metaphor are as in Table 3.

Table 3: Mapping schema of the metaphor STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS BUILDING

Source domain's attributes (*building*)		Target domain's attributes (*Strategic management*)
Buildings	⇨	Companies
Building process	⇨	Strategic management process

In accordance with the principle of partial and unilateral mapping, certain attributes from the source domain "building" like buildings' structure, architecture, building materials, building operations, etc. are mapped onto the target domain "strategic management," causing the target

domain to derive certain characteristics from the source domain in nominating terms. As clearly presented from the cognitive schema in Table 3, STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS BUILDING metaphor entails two derivative metaphors COMPANIES ARE BUILDINGS and STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT PROCESS IS BUILDING PROCESS. Let us now see how our central knowledge of building is projected onto the nomination of strategic management terminology.

4.2.1 *Conceptual metaphor COMPANIES ARE BUILDINGS*

The correspondence of the aspects of buildings and companies is achieved via a set of mappings between constituent elements of the source and those of the target. The first attribute to be highlighted in the metaphor COMPANIES ARE BUILDINGS is that the organizational structure is conceptualized as the physical structure of a building. The most crucial components that support a building are its framework and structure. In addition, buildings typically have a particular architectural style or archetype. As a result, expressions like frame, framework, structure, architecture, model, archetype literally explain the physical structure of a building. These words are utilized metaphorically to talk about the corresponding concepts in the target domain of the structure of companies, resulting in common metaphorical terms such as *organizational **structure**, centralized **structure**, decentralized **structure**, functional organizational **structure**, product-based **structure**, ownership **structure**, corporate **structure**, brand **architecture**, brand **archetype**, brand identity **model***, etc. Let us consider some classic examples of this mapping. *Corporate **structure*** refers to the way a company is organized, including how its departments and employees, etc. are connected with each other and the systems they use to work with each other; *Brand **architecture*** denotes the way in which a company organizes and names its products in order to show consumers the differences and similarities between them (Combley 2011).

When projecting the physical structure feature onto the target domain, a number of metaphorical terms view organizational structure as the physical structure of a building, which appear to be highly conventionalized and widely used/ extensively utilized.

Secondly, in regard to metaphorical conceptualization, characteristics of companies are conventionally viewed as characteristics of buildings. The organizational strength is conceptualized as the strength of the building. A robust, long-lasting building is seen to represent a successful company, whereas a weak building represents a failing one. Besides, the way in which the building is designed and constructed is deeply influenced by the surrounding landscape. Similarly, the macro and micro environment has a profound impact on companies. Therefore, in strategic management process, companies have to carry out ***environmental scanning***, which is a constant and careful analysis of the *business **environment*** including the ***internal environment*** and ***external environment*** of an organization so as to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats which may have an influence on the current and future strategies of the company. Companies will need to continuously evaluate their plans for success in light of changing *business **environment***. Like a house which is situated on a space or landscape, a company does business in a certain market. Therefore, words that literally explain the location or position of a building and be employed to create metaphorical terms denoting a company's market position. In addition, a physical building has boundaries and the house's door may be open or closed, the house may be large or small. These qualities are then superimposed on a company's characteristics to create metaphorical terms like ***closed**-end management company, **open**-end management company, **boundaryless** organization, strategic*

landscape, branded **house**, **house** of brands, brand **positioning**, brand **platform**, **medium-sized** company, **mid-size** business, competitive **environment**, **key** performance indicator, etc.

To take just some examples, **closed** corporation refers to a closed corporation is a company whose shares are held by a select few individuals who are usually closely associated with the business - Investopedia*)*; A ***front*** *organization* is "any entity set up by and controlled by another organization, such as intelligence agencies, terrorist organizations, secret societies, banned organizations, religious or political groups, or corporations (Wikipedia). A ***house of brands*** is a *business* **model** in which a company owns multiple brands that operate independently and target different market segments. Conversely, in a *branded* **house** the parent company serves as the primary brand, and all its products, endorsed brands or services carry its name. As shown in these instances, companies are conceptualized as buildings due to the mapping of certain characteristics of the building domain onto companies as a target domain. Just as buildings are constructed to stand solidly on a foundation, the designation of corporate terms from the building source domain with metaphorical elements such as "structure", "foundation", "architecture", etc. implies that companies are conventionally viewed as physical structures needed to be carefully planned, prepared, and structured to endure and maintain their stability over time.

4.2.2 *Conceptual metaphor STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT PROCESS IS BUILDING PROCESS*

Building construction describes the physical activity on a construction site that contributes to building or structure construction. There are three stages to the building process including pre-construction, construction, and post-construction. Similarly, the strategic management process includes three phases, strategy formulation, strategy implementation and strategy evaluation. Literally, expressions such as build, design, redesign, restructuring, construct, reshape, tool are used to describe activities or necessary tools in the building process. In reality, these words in the source domain of building are metaphorically utilized to denote strategic management process. Projecting these attributes onto the target domain nominates a great number of metaphorical expressions, for instance, *brand* **building** *process, organizational* **design***, global area organization* **design***, global hybrid organization* **design***, global functional organization* **design***, business process* **redesign***, brand* **alignment***, management* **tool***, strategic analysis* **tool,** etc.

Let us now see some representative examples for the perceived structural similarities between the concept of building process and strategic management process. *Corporate* **restructuring** is a type of action taken that involves significantly modifying the debt, operations, or structure of a company as a way of limiting financial harm and improving the business; *Brand* **building** is the process of marketing a brand, whether it be for product promotion, brand awareness, or simply connecting with target audience for the purpose of establishing a relationship with them. The collective understanding of strategic management process is enhanced by the metaphorization of terms denoting strategic management process, which is projected from a structured, collaborative, and incremental building process. Metaphorical elements such as "design", "restructuring", "alignment", etc. imply that companies should be built according to pre-defined plans that ensure structural integrity, allowing it to withstand internal challenges as well as external threats from the environment.

The extensive knowledge we have about the building process helps us to utilize the mapping from this source domain to understand the process of strategic management. The

metaphorical elements forming strategic management terms projected from the building source are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Metaphorical elements activated in the conceptual model STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS BUILDING

Derivative metaphors	Metaphorical element	Number of terms	Frequency (%)	Metaphorical element	Number of terms	Frequency (%)
COMPANIES ARE BUILDINGS	structure	36	25.90	size	3	2.16
	frame	1	0.72	boundary	1	0.72
	framework	4	2.88	boundaryless	2	1.44
	model	19	13.67	positioning	4	2.88
	architecture	1	0.72	position	2	1.44
	archetype	1	0.72	environment	5	3.60
	house	2	1.44	environmental	2	1.44
	key	5	3.60	closed	2	1.44
	edge	1	0.72	open	2	1.44
	area	1	0.72	front	1	0.72
	landscape	1	0.72	external	6	4.32
	platform	1	0.72	internal	6	4.32
	space	1	0.72	barrier	2	1.44
	Total	*112*	*80.58*			
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT PROCESS IS BUILDING PROCESS	design	6	4.32	build	1	0.72
	redesign	1	0.72	building	2	1.44
	construct	1	0.72	tool	11	7.92
	restructuring	2	1.44	align	1	0.72
	reshape	1	0.72	alignment	1	0.72
	Total	*27*	*19.42*			
Total		**139**	**100**			

As illustrated in Table 4, several strategic management terms are metaphorically nominated from the building source domain. Overall, the number of strategic management terms projected from aspects of a building are four times as much as those from the building process, which nominate 112 versus 27 metaphorical terms, representing 80.58% and 19.42% respectively. The most outstanding feature to be noticed is the physical structure which is mapped onto the organizational structure, with the metaphorical element "structure" resulting in 36 metaphorical terms (accounting for 25.90%), which means this metaphor highlights the creation of a well-structured company. The building attributes are systematically similar to those of strategic management, and the words that are used about buildings are employed systematically in connection with companies and their strategic management process.

It is important to note, buildings typically have rooms, ceilings, floors, doors, keys, walls, corridors. These words are quite commonly used in business, for instance "tariff wall", "price corridor", "sales floor", "price ceiling", and so on. However, these aspects of building are not representatives relating to characteristics of companies or strategic management process. This reflects the partial mapping between the two domains. This finding is also consistent with Kövecses's (2010) proclamation of conceptual metaphors that the mappings

between source and target are only partial; some elements of the source and the target are involved, but others are not.

5 Conclusion

Utilizing the Theory of Conceptual Metaphor, together with the metaphor identification procedure proposed by Pragglejaz (2007) to analyze the collected corpus, the study identifies two primary metaphors STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS A MILITARY AFFAIR and STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS BUILDING, entailing a number of derived metaphors in strategic management term nomination, namely COMPANIES ARE MILITARY FORCES, BUSINESS ACTIVITIES ARE MILITARY OPERATIONS, MARKET IS BATTLEFIELD, BUSINESS STRATEGY IS MILITARY STRATEGY, BUSINESS RESULTS ARE BATTLE RESULTS, COMPANIES ARE BUILDINGS, and STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT PROCESS IS BUILDING PROCESS.

The result of the study shows that STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT IS A MILITARY AFFAIR is a prominent metaphor which frequently shows up in words and phrases related to strategic management. The source domain aspects that are activated in this metaphor include military forces, battlefield, military operations, military strategy, and battle results. The mapping of the typical attributes of the military domain onto those of the target domain of strategic management clarifies the fierce competition in the market that every company has to employ the best strategy in order to gain competitive advantage, improve market share and plan for its future. The findings also reveal that the features from the source domain "building" are activated and mapped onto the target domain "strategic management" leading the target domain to bear certain attributes of the source domain such as the physical structure and characteristics of buildings, and the building process. Words denoting other aspects of building like rooms, parts of rooms, construction materials are not metaphorically employed in strategic management vocabulary. This study's findings are in line with the conclusion by Kövecses (2010) that the mappings between the source and target domain are only partial, some aspects of the source and the target are highlighted, but others are hidden. It is also worth pointing out that metaphorical terms projected from the military domain is much higher than those from the building source domain.

The research findings have proved that strategic management terminology is metaphorically nominated mostly as building and military affair, the attributes of which fall into categories distinguished by Lakoff & Johnson (2003) and Kövecses (2010). It was the application of these source domains to the strategic management domain that provided the concept of strategic management with particular structures or sets of attributes, helping us easily visualize the nature of strategic management activities. Also, these findings solidify the earlier conclusions which highlighted metaphorization as a productive way of forming new words and enriching specialized vocabulary by Sherizatova (2019), Alekseeva (2020), Khachmafova (2021), and Nguyen 2024.

There were some limitations to the present study that could be translated into opportunities for future research. The present study focuses on military affair and building source domains. In fact, strategic management has many additional aspects that are understood by means of a variety of further source domains, including sport, animal or journey. It is therefore hoped that other researchers would study the use of these domains in nominating strategic management terms.

References

Audebrand, Luc K. 2010. Sustainability in Strategic Management Education: The Quest for New Root Metaphors. *Academy of Management Learning & Education 9*(3). 413–428. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25782027

Alekseeva, Larisa & Mishlanova, Svetlana & Mishlanova, Svetlana. 2020. The metaphor cycle in a term-formation process. *Terminology - Terminology and the Present* 27. https://doi.org/10.35321/term27-03

Bogdanović, Milica. 2023. Conceptual metaphors in Economic discourse of Serbian and British newspaper articles. *PALIMPSEST / ПАЛИМПСЕСТ* 8(15). 27−37. https://doi.org/10.46763/PALIM23815027b

Borys, Dmytro. 2023. Conceptual Metaphor in English Slang Phytonyms. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 20(2). 79–98. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL53/04.pdf.

Bowman, Edward H. & Singh, Harbir & H. Thomas. 2002. *The domain of strategic management: History and evolution*, In PETTIGREW, A., THOMAS, H. and WHITTINGTON, R. (Ed.). Handbook of strategy and management, 31–51. London: Sage.

Celiešienė, Vilija & Juzelėnienė, Saulutė. 2019. Metaphorical Nomination in IT Terminology in Lithuanian and English Languages, *Journal of Language and Cultural Education* 7(1). 84–102. https://doi.org/10.2478/jolace-2019-0006

Ciobanu, Georgeta. 1997. *Introduction to terminology.* Timisoara: Editura Politechnica.

Combley, Roz. 2011. *Cambridge Business English Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press.

David, Fred & David, Forest & David, Meredith. 2020. *Strategic management: A Competitive Advantage Approach, Concepts and Cases* (17th ed.). Pearson.

Dess, Gregory & McNamara, Gerry & Eisner, Alan & Lee, Seung-Hyun & G.T. Lumpkin. 2023. *Strategic Management: Text and Cases* (11th ed.). McGraw Hill.

Gkalitsiou, Katerina & Kotsopoulos, Dimosthenis. 2023. When the Going Gets Tough, Leaders Use Metaphors and Storytelling: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study on Communication in the Context of COVID-19 and Ukraine Crises. *Administrative Sciences*, 13: 110. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13040110

Gibbs, Raymond W. 2008. *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816802

Grant, R. 2002. *Corporate strategy: Managing scope and strategy content*. In PETTIGREW, A., THOMAS, H. and WHITTINGTON, R. (Ed.). Handbook of strategy and management, 72–97. London: Sage.

Faber, Pamela. 2012. A *Cognitive linguistics view of terminology and specialized language*, Series: Applications of Cognitive Linguistics [ACL] 20, De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110277203

Flusberg, Stephen J. & Matlock, Teenie & Thibodeau, Paul. 2018. War metaphors in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 33(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2018.1407992

Freedman, Lawrence. 2015. *Strategy: A History*. Oxford University Press.

Hornby, A S. 2015. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (9th Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Kageura, Kyo. 2002. *The Dynamics of Terminology. A descriptive theory f term formation and Terminological Growth.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kelly, Louise & Booth, Chris. 2004. *Dictionary of Strategy: Strategic Management A-Z*, SAGE Publications.

Khachmafova, Zaineta & Ostrovskaya, Tatiana & Skhalyakho, Elena. 2021. The conceptual design of oil-and-gas metaphorical terms, *XIV International Scientific and Practical Conference "State and Prospects for the Development of Agribusiness*. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202127311045

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010. *Metaphor: A practical introduction*, 2nd revised ed. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2015. *Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Zoltán & Benczes, Réka & Rommel, Anna & Szelid, Veronika. 2024. Universality versus variation in the conceptualization of ANGER: A question of methodology. *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 28(1). 55–79. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-34834

Lakoff, George. 1993. The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.) *Metaphor and thought,* 202–251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark. 2003. *Metaphors we live by. Chicago*: University of Chicago Press.

Lu, Louis Wei-Lun & Ahrens, Kathleen. 2008. Ideological influence on BUILDING metaphors in Taiwanese presidential speeches. *Discourse & Society* 19(3). 383–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508088966

Malik, Awais. 2023. Evaluating the Visual Metaphors of Financial Concepts through Content Analysis. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* 16(3). 202. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm16030202

Mujagić, Mersina. 2024. POLITICS metaphor in British and Bosnian Herzegovinian migration discourse. *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 28(1). 144–165. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-34534

Nguyen, Thi Bich Hanh & Le, Vien Lan Huong & Pham, Hien. 2022. Conceptual Metaphor SPORT AS WAR in Vietnamese Football News. *Cognitive Linguistic Studies* 9(2). 266–296. https://doi.org/10.1075/cogls.20010.

Nguyen, Thi Thuy Hanh. 2024. Conceptual Metaphor BUSINESS IS A JOURNEY in Business Terminology. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 14(11). 3463–3470.

Paul, Namrata & Satsangi, Abhijeet & Ghosh, Sanjukta. 2024. Cognitive Semantic Analysis of Fear Expressions in Bangla and Hindi. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 21(1). 92–119. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL56/05.pdf.

Pragglejaz Group. 2007. MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22(1). 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752

Prasad, Ajit. 2004. *A Dictionary of Strategic Management*, Excel Books.

Ptiček, Martina & Dobša, Jasminka. 2023. Methods of Annotating and Identifying Metaphors in the Field of Natural Language Processing. *Future Internet* 15. 201. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi15060201

Shehab, Ekrema & Nazzal, Rema. 2022. A cognitive analysis of war metaphors in English business texts and their Arabic translations, *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies* 9(1). 73–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/23306343.2022.2054213

Sherizatova, Zh. Zh. 2019. *Metaphor is a productive way in the formation of medical terminology*, Bulletin of the Karagand a University, Karaganda.

Silaški, Nadežda. 2009. Economic Terminology In Serbian And Croatian: A Comparative Analysis Of Anglicisms, Facta Universitatis, *Series: Linguistics and Literature* 7(1). 75–86.

Silaški, Nadežda & Đurović, Tatjana. 2024. The explanatory function of metaphor scenario in the Serbian pro-vaccine discourse. *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 28(1). 123–143. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-34958

Stunžinas, Robertas. 2006. Metaforiniai statybos terminai. *Terminologija* 13. 62–75.

Xie, Cécile. 2023. Metaphors as Knowledge in Mystical Writings. *Religions* 14(8). 1039. https://doi.org/10.3390/ rel14081039

Xu, Mengyu & Park, Homin & Lee, Sunghwa & Kim, Soojung & Jhang, Se-Eun. 2023. A corpus-based study of metaphor and metonymy in Maritime English. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 23. 961-979. https://doi.org/10.15738/kjell.23..202310.961

Wiliński, Jarosław. 2017. War Metaphors in Business: A Metaphostructional Analysis. *ANGLICA-An International Journal of English Studies 26*(2). 61-78. https://doi.org/10.7311/0860-5734.26.2.05

Zeng, Winnie Huiheng & Ahrens, Kathleen. 2023. Corpus-Based Metaphorical Framing Analysis: WAR Metaphors in Hong Kong Public Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol 38*(3). 254-274. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2022.2158088

Zibin, Aseel, Khalifah, Lama & R.M. Altakhaineh, Abdel. 2024. The role of metaphor in creating polysemy complexes in Jordanian Arabic and American English. *Russian Journal of Linguistics* *28*(1). 80–101. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-34555

Zhu, Xiaoyan & Yanbing, Huang & Wenxuan, Liu & Zhao, Yu &Yan, Duan & Xianyou, He & Wei, Zhang. 2023. Keeping Morality "on the Straight" and Never "on the Bend": Metaphorical Representations of Moral Concepts in Straightness and Curvature. *Behavioral Sciences* 13. 295. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13040295

Online Sources
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Front_organization (Accessed February 26, 2024)
https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/backflip-takeover.asp (Accessed March 01, 2024)
https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/closed-corporation.asp (Accessed March 05, 2024)

Nguyen Thi Thuy Hanh
Faculty of English
Thuongmai University
79 Ho Tung Mau, Hanoi, Vietnam
e-mail: Nguyenthuyhanh79@tmu.edu.vn