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Abstract
In the last 10 years, a highly productive space of metaphor analysis has been established in the discourse studies of media, politics, business, and education. In the theoretical framework of Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis, the restored metaphorical patterns are especially valued for their implied ideological value as realized both conceptually and linguistically. By using the analytical framework of Critical Metaphor Analysis and procedurally employing Pragglejaz Group’s Metaphor Identification Procedure, this study aims at analyzing the implied value of the evoked metaphors in the mission statements of the first 20 European Universities, according to the Webometrics ranking. In this article, it is proposed that Universities’ mission statements are based on the positive evaluation of the COMMERCE metaphor, which does not fully correlate with the ideological framework of sustainability education but is rather oriented toward consumerism in both education and society. Despite this overall trend, there are some traceable features of the conceptualization reflecting the sustainability approach to higher education, as related to freedom of speech, tolerance, and environmental concerns. Nonetheless, these are suppressed by the metaphoric usages evoking traditional dogmas of the conservative ideology grounded in the concepts of the transactional approach to relationship, competitiveness for superiority, the importance of self-interest and strength, and quantifiable quality.
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Introduction

Metaphor analysis today is valued for its implied ideological meaning. Metaphorical expressions are analyzed with the purpose of reconstructing their underlying conceptual frames and restoring their moral matrix or hidden ideological value (see Charteris-Black, 2009, 2011; Goatly, 2007; Lakoff, 1996, 2004, 2006; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Musolff, 2010). Metaphors are thus seen as both tools of thought and mechanisms reflecting our worldviews. As based on these assumptions, the purpose of this study is to metaphorically analyze the mission statements of 20 top European Universities and determine their implied ideological value. The ideological meaning of metaphors is expected to provide answers to the questions as follows: What do the restored metaphors imply about the education standards in the 20 top European Universities? How do these standards correlate with the modern idea of “sustainability education?”

Before I examine what kind of ideology is reproduced and ascertained by metaphors in Universities’ mission statements, in the first part (“Discourse, Metaphor, Ideology”), I analyze the key concepts of discourse, metaphor, and ideology in more specific terms. Taking sustainability education as an expected paradigm in the system of university education, in the second part (“Sustainability Education as Related to the Liberal Ideology”), I discuss the main characteristics of this approach. In the sections “What the UNIVERSITY IS A BUSINESS PERSON Metaphor Implies” and “What Is Shared by the QUANTITY and COMPETITION Metaphors in Higher Education Discourse,” I present and discuss my research findings in terms of the two prevailing metaphoric patterns (the PERSONIFICATION and COMMERCE metaphors and the QUANTITY and COMPETITION metaphors). In the “Conclusion” section, I present some concluding remarks.

Discourse, Metaphor, and Ideology

In the current approaches to metaphor analysis, metaphor is seen as inseparable from discourse and ideology (Charteris-Black, 2011; Chilton, 2005; Goatly, 2007; Koller, 2004, 2009; Lakoff, 1996, 2004, 2011). From a discourse analysis perspective, the understanding of metaphors in discourse is
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treated as the beginning of a new debate about their implied meaning and how metaphors impact further activities (Zinken & Musolf, 2009). Recent research has shown that different understandings of metaphors depend on the narratives these metaphors are embedded in (Chilton, 2004; Hart, 2011; Hellsten, 2002; Koller, 2009; Musolff, 2006; Nerlich & Keteyko, 2009). Discourse, at this point, should be perceived as an interactive narrative constructing social identities and ideologies (Anna de Fina, 2011; Teun van Dijk, 2011). This more recent perception of discourse fits well into and complements the generally accepted notion of discourse as a social practice ordering power relations in a society as initially proposed by Fairclough (2001, 2003). Thus, in this article taking discourse as both a social practice and a collective narrative, the interaction of metaphor and ideology should be perceived as an interplay of micro and macro discourse mechanisms. Let me define and illustrate each of them in more detail as follows.

Cognitive linguists perceive metaphor as a reflection of general conceptual organization, categorization principles, and processing mechanisms (see Gibbs, 1999; Grady, 1999; Kövecses, 2002, 2009; Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Mey, 2006). In this view, metaphor is seen as a specific mental mapping and a neural co-activation influencing the way people think, reason, and imagine in their everyday life (Johnson, 1993; Lakoff, 1996; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). More importantly, as noted by Lakoff (2004), metaphorical thought is used constantly, and people “act on these metaphors” (p. 13). Metaphors may vary from a person to a person, thus not all forms of reasoning are universal (Lakoff, 2004). The micro level of metaphors can be discerned by identifying and analyzing linguistic metaphorical expressions subsequently restoring them into metaphors, that is, A IS B (more on that, see Croft & Cruse, 2004; Kövecses, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Taylor, 2002). The analysis of metaphors, in its turn, leads to different observations about views or ideologies. Let us turn now to the definition of ideology in more explicit terms as follows.

By ideology is meant here what Teun Van Dijk (2011) refers to as a form of socially shared and distributed cognition or a system of socially shared beliefs that may control many kinds of social practice. It is assumed that ideologies and their structures influence attitudes, mental models, and the choice of discourse structures (Van Dijk, 2011). Metaphor as both a mental model and a discourse structure can be explored for it ideological implications and evaluation patterns (see Chilton & Schäffner, 2011; Goatly, 2007; Kövecses, 2002). According to Goatly (2007), most metaphorical models “have ideological implications, in the sense that they are recruited and used by those exerting economic, scientific, political or personal power” (p. 35). Let us consider a few examples of metaphors, and what kind of ideology they create, reinforce, or enact.

For instance, the conventional IMPORTANCE IS SIZE metaphor, by which the source domain of size or height is used for or mapped onto various overlapping positive qualities such as importance, power, authority, status, success, and so on. In everyday language, this metaphor can be illustrated by the following metaphorical expressions: a big decision, make a big thing of, a big day, great men, a big name, a top man/woman, high places, at the peak of one’s career, and so on (Goatly, 2007, p. 35-36). The use of this metaphor has made size or height an ideological symbol of power, success, achievement, and importance. As noted by Goatly (2007), the symbolism of height as power is especially noticeable in constructing high buildings. The ideological power of this metaphor is well illustrated by a non-linguistic act, as having occurred on September 11, 2007, when the World Trade Centre was attacked with the purpose to reduce the power, success, and importance of the United States (Lakoff, 2011).

Another example, as related to 9/11, is the metaphor of war on terror, by using which the U.S. president Bush justified his decision to start military actions in Iraq. The conservative ideology of this metaphor is based on the perception that anything related to terrorism is evil that has to be stopped by any means, including military intervention. More importantly, the ideology of this metaphor has been extended to other areas of public life, one of which is environmentalist policies. In 2010, in the United States, a new law was passed to protect companies from animal rights activists, whose acts against corporations were referred to as “terror attacks.” The extended use of this metaphor has allowed criminalizing environmentalists and their actions against corporations, although corporations are treated as human beings whose rights can be violated (see Lakoff, 2006).

The last but not least illustration of how metaphors shape our reality and construe ideologies is the HUMAN IS A COMMODITY metaphor. This metaphorical conceptualization of humans in terms of machines, computers, food, or commodities in general is applied not only to human bodies but also to relationships, knowledge, and the quality of human life (see Goatly, 2007). The ideology of this metaphor evokes the frame of conservative morality, especially in the language of economic discourse, wherein employees are seen as assets and resources, while big corporations as humans (see Lakoff, 2004, 2006). The use of these metaphors allows corporations and governments to maintain “cheap labour trap,” by which the economy is structured around low-wage jobs, and very little or no economic freedom is provided to working people (Lakoff, 2006, pp. 156-159).

Metaphor has thus become an important object of analysis to detect how ideology is created, reinforced, and enacted. Its importance has been discussed and analyzed in various genres of political and economic discourse (Charteris-Black, 2009, 2011; Koller, 2004; Lakoff, 2006; Musolff, 2006); however, Universities’ mission statements as a variety of higher education discourse have not been addressed anywhere in the critical metaphor analysis.
In the following sections, I will overview the underlying sustainability education approach (“Sustainability Education as Related to the Liberal Ideology”) and show how metaphors in Universities’ mission statements ideologically operate and implicitly negate this approach (“What the UNIVERSITY IS A BUSINESS PERSON Metaphor Implies”).

**Sustainability Education as Related to the Liberal Ideology**

The concept of “sustainability education” has been introduced in the document of Agenda 21 of the United Nations with the purpose of identifying education as an essential tool for achieving sustainable development across the world. In recognition of education for sustainable development, the United Nations Assembly has declared 2005 through 2014 the UN Decade for Education for Sustainable Development (see Unesco.com). According to Anthony Cortese (2003), most formal education is lacking such sustainability approach and rather oriented toward individual fragmented learning and competition. As based on that, modern higher education is criticized for developing a consumer society, while the “sustainability education” approach is expected to evoke transformative changes required for the development of a sustainable society.

The sustainability education approach is perceived as a necessary transformative change of ideas, values, and actions for creating a just and sustainable future across the world. The underlying concept of this approach is sustainability, as related to both knowledge and experience based on supporting, maintaining, or enduring environmental, social, and economic development founded on “respect for nature, human rights, economic justice, and a culture of peace” (see the Earthcharterinaction.org). Despite the evidence of the need to transform traditional education into the sustainability approach, much of modern higher education stresses “individual learning and competition, resulting in professionals who are ill-prepared for cooperative efforts” by thus opposing key sustainability values (Cortese, 2003, p. 16). To make the sustainability approach in Higher Education a reality, a transformative shift in ideas, thinking, and actions is necessary (Calaprice, 2002; Cortese, 2003).

By this study, I will attempt to decipher the underlying ideas of Universities’ mission statements with the purpose of identifying their conceptual and ideological nature. In other words, it is aimed to qualify whether the sustainability approach to higher education is implemented or ignored in the discourse of Universities’ mission statements.

**A Qualitative Approach to Metaphor Analysis: Methodology and Research Findings**

To achieve the above mentioned, the mission statements of the first 20 EU Universities were collected and analyzed in terms of metaphoric usages (in the time span of June to August, 2014), which were subsequently restored into conceptual metaphors and ideologically grouped. The Webometrics ranking of the Universities has been followed in this study, as provided by the Cybermetrics Lab (Spanish National Research Council, CSIC). The Ranking Web or Webometrics is the largest academic ranking of Higher Education Institutions, which is performed by the Cybermetrics Lab for the providing “reliable, multidimensional, updated, and useful information about the performance of universities from all over the world based on their web presence and impact” (see Webometrics.info). This ranking system is based on the composite indicator that takes into account both the volume of the Web contents and the visibility and impact of these web publications according to the number of external inlinks they received (Webometrics.info). The data were collected from the websites of the first 20 European Universities ranked by the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

The overall research data consist of 12,261 words and 595 metaphorical expressions. As provided in Table 1 below, the universities (see B) are presented in accord with their Webometrics ranking (see A); in addition, the total number of words for each mission statement (see C) is provided. Also, there are details about the total number of metaphorical expressions for each mission statement (see D), as well as its metaphoric density (see E). By the latter is meant, the average frequency of one metaphoric expression in the statement of each university. Finally, for the sake of comparison, the two most frequent source domains are provided (see F).

The data analysis has shown that a University mission statement is a variety of higher education discourse whereby the aims, objectives, and raised standards of an academic institution are defined and described. Due to the average density of metaphoric usages of the collected data (i.e., 1 metaphor expression per approximately 29 words), the description is metaphorically loaded. Moreover, the analysis of the collected metaphoric expressions has demonstrated that the mission statements of almost all 20 universities are ideologically constructed in terms of the following source domains: PERSONIFICATION, COMMERCE, COMPETITION, and QUANTITY.

Pragglejaz Group’s (2007) MIP was used as a research tool of identifying metaphoric expressions in the selected texts. The main principle of the procedure is to analyze the contextual and basic meanings of the selected expressions and decide whether these two meanings contrast but can be understood in comparison with each other (Pragglejaz Group, 2007, p. 9). The basic meaning refers here to the meaning of a lexical unit which tends to be more either (1) more concrete, or (2) related to bodily action, or (3) more precise (as opposed to vague), or (4) historically older (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). The following dictionary sources were used to analyse the basic meaning of the lexical units: two online sources of OED (http://www.oxforddictionaries.
## Table 1. Research Data and Findings.

| A | Universities                                                         | B | No. of words in the MS | C | No. of metaphorical expressions | D | Density | E | Prevailing source domains               |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|---------|---|-----------------------------------------|
| 1 | University of Oxford                                                |   | 1,059                  |   | 45                              |   | 1 me per 23 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 2 | University of Cambridge                                            |   | 279                    |   | 25                              |   | 1 me per 11 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 3 | University College London                                          |   | 242                    |   | 15                              |   | 1 me per 16 words                      |   | STRUCTURE                                |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 4 | Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich                     |   | 729                    |   | 38                              |   | 1 me per 20 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | JOURNEY                                  |
| 5 | University of Edinburgh                                            |   | 136                    |   | 15                              |   | 1 me per 9 words                       |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 6 | Utrecht University                                                  |   | 379                    |   | 19                              |   | 1 me per 20 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 7 | University of Vienna                                                |   | 430                    |   | 19                              |   | 1 me per 23 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | SIZE & SPACE                            |
| 8 | Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne                           |   | 633                    |   | 62                              |   | 1 me per 10 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 9 | Heidelberg University                                               |   | 582                    |   | 52                              |   | 1 me per 11 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | QUANTITY                                 |
| 10| University of Amsterdam                                             |   | 194                    |   | 15                              |   | 1 me per 13 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | QUANTITY                                 |
| 11| The Complutense University of Madrid                                 |   | 237                    |   | 23                              |   | 1 me per 10 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 12| Sapienza University of Rome                                         |   | 382                    |   | 18                              |   | 1 me per 21 words                      |   | COMMERCE                                 |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | SIZE                                     |
| 13| University of Copenhagen                                           |   | 1,167                  |   | 36                              |   | 1 me per 32 words                      |   | COMMERCE                                 |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | SIZE                                     |
| 14| University of Helsinki EU                                            |   | 1,025                  |   | 38                              |   | 1 me per 27 words                      |   | COMMERCE                                 |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | QUANTITY                                 |
| 15| Lomonosov Moscow State University                                   |   | 1,773                  |   | 51                              |   | 1 me per 35 words                      |   | COMMERCE                                 |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | POSITIONING                             |
| 16| The University of Porto                                             |   | 549                    |   | 25                              |   | 1 me per 22 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 17| University of Oslo                                                  |   | 347                    |   | 10                              |   | 1 me per 35 words                      |   | COMPETITION                             |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 18| Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich                              |   | 429                    |   | 21                              |   | 1 me per 20 words                      |   | COMPETITION                             |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
| 19| University of Glasgow                                               |   | 1,045                  |   | 38                              |   | 1 me per 28 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMMERCE                                 |
| 20| The University of Bonn                                              |   | 644                    |   | 30                              |   | 1 me per 21 words                      |   | PERSONIFICATION                         |
|   |                                                                     |   |                        |   |                                 |   |         |   | COMPETITION                             |

| Total | 12,261 | Total | 595 |
com) and thesaurus (www.dictionary.com), and one Oxford paperback reference—Concise Dictionary of English Etymology (1996). If the basic and contextual meanings of the selected unit or expression contrast but can be understood in comparison with each other, it is marked as metaphorical. For example, the QUALITY IS QUANTITY metaphor is frequently evoked, as in the statement below:

(1) The University staff is recognized and rewarded as its greatest asset. (Cambridge)

In this context, the noun “asset” is associated with the positive qualities attributed to people. By contrast, the basic meaning of the noun is related to quantity, namely, a single item of ownership having exchange value or a useful thing. The contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it: We can understand abstract quality as related to people in terms of physical quantity, value, and use. This metaphor evokes the conservative ideology, by which people or employees are perceived as resources and whose lives are controlled by corporations (see Lakoff, 2006).

As I propose, the underlying metaphors in the mission statements of the first 20 European Universities are based on the traditional conservative ideology, as being opposed to the sustainability approach to higher education. This kind of ideology is supportive of the traditional approach to education, emphasizing vertical hierarchy in relationship, competitive framework of pursuing individual rather than collective goals, and serving short-term benefits. Nonetheless, it should also be noted that despite this overall traditionally oriented trend, the mission statements of some universities have some features of sustainability approach.

In the following section, I will discuss and illustrate these prevalent metaphors and their ideological significance and inter-relatedness. In the section “What the UNIVERSITY IS A BUSINESS PERSON Metaphor Implies,” the correlation of PERSONIFICATION and COMMERCE metaphors will be discussed, while section “What Is Shared by the QUANTITY and COMPETITION Metaphors in Higher Education Discourse” analyzes the ideological nature of QUANTITY and COMPETITION metaphors.

### What the UNIVERSITY IS A BUSINESS PERSON Metaphor Implies

The analysis has shown that the mission statements of all 20 European universities are metaphorically structured through two source domains of PERSON and COMMERCE. These two source domains result in the conceptual mapping of UNIVERSITY IS A BUSINESS PERSON, wherein the PERSON source domain plays a primary role, while the COMMERCE domain is secondary. Ideologically, the purpose of higher education is presented through the identity of a person, whose main concern is to be involved in commercial activities. Let us first consider what the analysis of the PERSONIFIED metaphor discloses.

The UNIVERSITY IS A PERSON metaphor or so-called personification is particularly valued for its ideological intricacies. There are two merits of this metaphor. First, it has a strong emotional appeal to the receivers and its use directly affects receivers’ perceptions. The ideological spectrum of this metaphor is based on the strategy of Positive Self-Presentation. Any of the top 20 EU universities is described as a person whose qualities are presented from the most positive perspective, especially as related to commercial activities. Such description has a strong emotional appeal; thus, this kind of metaphor serves a twofold purpose: first, to raise positive emotions toward a particular institution (i.e., via THE UNIVERSITY IS A PERSON metaphor) and, second, to ideologically imply about its significance (i.e., via the COMMERCE metaphor). To clarify, the ideological importance is transferred through the set of positive personal characteristics as attributed to a higher institution. This ideological structure is reproduced in Table 2 below.

As can be seen from Table 2, the analysis of the UNIVERSITY IS A PERSON metaphor has allowed me to structure its underlying ideology in terms of characteristic aspects of human behavior, as ascribed to a higher institution. The analysis has shown that the metaphorical usages are with the reference to five semantic roles: (a) identity, (b) activity, (c) relationship, (d) goals, and (e) values. The identity of a higher institution is associated with the identity of a special, who is one of the best, most competitive and respectable (see Identity role in Table 2). The use of such attributes implies about competitiveness among institutions for special or best students. The principles of market economy are applied to the standards of higher education. The underlying assumptions of the market economy are related to pragmatism or pragmatic mentality, which guides people to primarily serve individual interests and seek short-term benefits. This kind pragmatic identity is also supported by other semantic roles as evoked by the PERSONIFICATION metaphors. The analysis of the verbs has shown that the activity associated with the university as a person is related to the field of commerce (see (3) and (4) in Table 2). To illustrate this, consider the interplay of the semantic roles of activity and in (11) and (12), as evoked by the UNIVERSITY IS A PERSON metaphor:

(11) The UvA seeks to offer an inspiring international academic environment in which both staff and students can develop their talents optimally. (Amsterdam)

(12) Our University is focused on developing excellence based on wide networks of quality groups, on boosting emerging groups, and on incorporating young researchers. (Madrid)

(13) The University has invested around £650,000 in a range of three-year Fellowships covering a diverse and innovative array of interdisciplinary projects. (Glasgow)

The use of the verb “offer” in (11), or the verbs “develop optimally,” “boost,” and “incorporate” in (12), or “invest” in (13) is related to the conceptual domain of a commercial activity, whereby a beneficial exchange between a university
and students is implied. There are instances of clear references to the benefits of such an exchange, as in (14) below.

(14) We have also announced this year a major new initiative designed to ensure the most talented graduate students from all over the world can benefit from what Oxford has to offer. (Oxford)

This gives evidence to the inter-relatedness of the personified and commerce metaphors (i.e., the EDUCATION IS AN ACT OF COMMERCE metaphor). As in (14) above, the university is perceived as a person who offers, while the students are those who gain benefits. The implied COMMERCE metaphor is based on the positive representation of universities. In all mission statements, the 20 European universities are represented through the concept of leadership, which is linguistically realized through different parts of speech, that is, nouns, verbs, adjectives. Compare how the concept of leadership is linguistically supported in (15), (16), and (17).

(15) ETH Zurich is one of the leading international universities for technology and the natural sciences.

(16) As a world-leading centre of academic excellence we aim to: enhance our position as one of the world’s leading research and teaching universities . . . . (Edinburgh)

(17) The University aims to take the lead in implementing the Bologna principles into its teaching programs. (Utrecht)

The basic meaning of the verb “lead” and its derived forms refers to “go first,” “be in advance,” or “surpass” is sustained in the modern use of this word and evoked by the metaphor of EDUCATION IS AN ACT OF COMMERCE in the context of Universities’ mission statements. Even more, its use is complemented by the ideological frame of competitiveness that is continuously emphasized as a constituent element not only in the inter- but also in the intra-educational context. In their mission statements, universities are presented as people, competing for the status of leadership in various contexts. Thus, competitiveness is presented as essential to becoming the best and the most successful in the context of higher education. To illustrate this, consider how the frame of competitiveness is explicitly evoked in (18) and implicitly in (19) and (20).

(18) Occupying a leading position in Germany and in Europe, the University is committed to providing its global competitiveness. (Heidelberg)

(19) Sapienza carries out outstanding scientific research in most disciplines, achieving impressive results both on a national and international level. (Sapienza)

(20) Founded in 1640, the University of Helsinki wants to strengthen its position among the world’s leading multidisciplinary research universities and to actively promote the well-being of humanity and a fair society. (Helsinki)

In (18), by evoking the UNIVERSITY IS A PERSON metaphor, it is stated that leadership is an effect of competitiveness. By comparison, in (19), the same model of competitiveness is implied by the use of such attributes as “outstanding” and “impressive” sharing the basic meaning of

Table 2. The Ideological Structure of the UNIVERSITY IS A PERSON Metaphor.

| Roles       | Entailment             | Examples                                                                 |
|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| IDENTITY    | What kind of a person is presented? SPECIAL | Oxford’s remarkable global appeal continues to grow. (Oxford) A special status of the University was ensured by the supreme authority of its Founder, Empress Elizaveta Petrovna (Lomonosov) |
| ACTIVITY    | What does this person do? ACTIVELY PERFORMS | The University’s core mission is to train new generations of researchers, produce academics who have both specialist knowledge and professional skills, conduct ground-breaking research, address social issues, and work toward solving them (Utrecht) The University of Bonn operates internationally, actively seeks cooperation, and sets clear subject priorities (Bonn) |
| RELATIONSHIP | What kind of relationship does this person hold? IMPORTANT | As a great civic, University of Edinburgh especially values its intellectual and economic relationship with the Scottish community. The University of Copenhagen is a member of IARU (International Alliance of Research Universities) |
| GOALS       | What does this person want to obtain? LEADERSHIP | In the context of global civilization, it must respond to changing conditions, it must identify new problems as a kind of early warning system, and assume a leading role in seeking solutions. (Zurich) The UCM (The Complutense University of Madrid) aspires to be among the foremost universities in Europe and to become a reference centre for Latin America. |
| VALUES      | What are this person’s values? TRADITIONAL | Commitment, inspiration, ambition and independence are Utrecht University’s core values. Our University is committed to truth, fairness, and respect. (Glasgow) |
“being marked by distinction or superiority.” While in (20), the concept of strength, evoked in the verbal phrase of “strengthen one’s position,” supports not only the competitiveness frame but also the traditional conservative ideology.

According to Lakoff (1996, 2006), one of the underlying metaphors of the conservative populism is MORALITY IS STRENGTH. In the conservative framework, only strong people are viewed as able to compete and succeed in life. Thus, competition is seen as a crucial and moral condition for “the development and sustenance of the right kind of person” (Lakoff, 1996, p. 69). The same moral matrix is extended to universities continuously competing for the status of better or the best. Competition thus implies hierarchy that legitimizes authority of the more successful over the less successful. In the case of higher education, the hierarchy is explicit in terms of the ranking system itself; however, the legitimate authority of the universities of higher rank over the universities of lower rank is implicit in terms of entrenched attitudes and the level of responsibility the higher universities are expected to declare.

Another feature of the conservative ideology is reflected by the frame of MORAL AUTHORITY. In the mission statements of the top 20 European Universities, this frame is disclosed through the use of such concepts as responsibility, independence, discipline, and rules. Consider how these concepts are evoked in the statements of (21), (22), and (23).

(21) Make a significant, sustainable and socially responsible contribution to Scotland, the United Kingdom, and the world, promoting health and economic and cultural well-being. (Edinburgh)

(22) The University upholds the principle of freedom of research and education, acknowledging its responsibility to humanity, society, and nature. (Heidelberg)

(23) The free thinking and spirit of open inquiry that is in Oxford’s DNA is anything but free in a financial sense when done with the disciplined rigor and intensity on which we are proud to insist. (Oxford)

In (21) and (22), the concept of responsibility is evoked in the framework of the conservative ideology. This is due to the hierarchical relationship, activated by the Strict Father morality (i.e., the metaphors of moral strength and authority), when the stronger feel superior and responsible for the weaker. The same perception is evoked in the mission statements; for instance, one of the core values mentioned is responsibility to society, nature, humanity, and the world. In (23), the mentioning of discipline in the phrase “disciplined rigor” or “intensity” contribute both to moral strength and competition frames, as implied by the basic meaning of these words.

Despite the more traditional approach to education, as related to the UNIVERSITY IS A PERSON metaphor, there are some features of the liberal worldview in the collected data of a few universities, namely, Cambridge, Amsterdam, Madrid, and Porto. To illustrate, consider how the liberal ideology is evoked through the concepts of freedom, nurturance, balance, and sustainability.

(24) The University’s core values are as follows: freedom of thought and expression, freedom from discrimination . . . . concern for sustainability and the relationship with the environment. (Cambridge)

(25) Characterized by a critical, creative, and international atmosphere, the UvA has a long tradition of open-mindedness and engagement with social issues, in keeping with the spirit of the city with which it is inextricably linked. (Amsterdam)

(26) Our activity is based on the principles of democracy, transparency, sustainability of the campus, virtual and real accessibility, preservation of the environment and commitment to the socio-economic environment. (Compultense of Madrid)

(27) The University of Porto provides the conditions for the exercise of freedom of scientific, cultural, artistic, and technological creativity, ensures plurality and free expression of opinions . . . . The University of Porto ensures equal access and treatment, irrespective of gender and social, political, ethnic, or religious issues . . . . The University of Porto strives for a balanced environmental, economic, and social development. (Porto)

In the overall set of the collected metaphoric expressions, there have been found only four instances where the importance of freedom of ideas, nurturing attitude to the environment and society, and collective responsibility are emphasized. By contrast, the majority of the clarified metaphoric usages are related to the source domain of COMMERCE, where the importance of competitive attitude, individualistic gains, and hierarchical relationship are prioritized.

Even more, as a complex metaphoric system, the EDUCATION IS AN ACT OF COMMERCE also involves the PEOPLE ARE COMMODITIES/RESOURCES metaphor. This combination is similar to what has been discussed by Lakoff (2004) in his argument about conservative populism and the metaphors of CORPORATIONS ARE PEOPLE and PEOPLE ARE RESOURCES. The use of these conceptual frames leads to the situations and actions where and when corporations are treated as people whose rights have to be protected, while people are depersonalized and viewed as commodities. Similar instances can be found in the collected data, for example,

(28) . . . recognition and reward of the University’s staff as its greatest asset. (Cambridge)

(29) You can find out here about a few of the exciting and important developments over a 12 month period in the life of our University. Among them the launch of the Blavatnik School
of Government and the arrival of its first intake of students . . . (Oxford)

(30) The University’s core mission is to . . . produce academics who have both specialist knowledge and professional skills. (Utrecht)

(31) EPFL is Europe’s most cosmopolitan technical university. It receives students, professors, and staff from more than 120 nationalities. (Lausanne)

(32) Receiving about 2,000 students and academics from abroad, the University sends out about the same number of its own professors, instructors, and students to various countries all over the globe. (Lomonosov)

In the provided examples, the following conceptual aspects of the COMMERCE metaphor are exploited: investment (33), scheming (33, 35), cooperation (34, 37), entrepreneurship (36), innovative development (36), sphere of influence (37), service (37), funding (35, 37), and staff recruitment (37). The COMMERCE metaphor can be interpreted both explicitly and implicitly. The explicit interpretation aims at the appealing representation of the institution. By using the COMMERCE metaphor and describing the university as a successful entrepreneur actively competing in the “market” of higher education, it is intended to emotionally appeal to new students or “consumers.” The institution of higher education is presented as another commodity worth obtaining.

This conceptual frame is further supported by the QUANTITY and COMPETITION metaphors of the mission statements of the first 20 European Universities, according to the Webometrics ranking. In the following section, the interrelatedness of the QUANTITY and COMPETITION metaphors will be analyzed.

What Is Shared by the QUANTITY and COMPETITION Metaphors in Higher Education Discourse

It has been determined that the QUANTITY and COMPETITION metaphors are the most frequently realized mappings next to the PERSONIFICATION and COMMERCE metaphors. In particular, the QUANTITY and COMPETITION metaphors are complementing the COMMERCE metaphor in terms of the central topics, attitudes, and self-image projected through universities’ mission statements. To be more precise, both the source domains of quantity and competition are subsidiary to the source domain of commerce, with the former highlighting the importance of high numbers associated with quality and the latter emphasizing relationship based on contest. Both source domains are related to the conservative ideology, as the QUANTITY metaphor emphasizes the importance and positive attitude to the numerical “strength,” and the COMPETITION metaphor implies about the positive evaluation of rivalry.

The data analysis has shown that the source domain of QUANTITY is evoked to imply about the quality of the higher institution, that is, the QUANTITY IS QUALITY metaphor. The positive self-image of the university is reflected in
the provided numbers that stand for quality of an institution. It has also been observed that universities of the lower ranking provide more numbers to imply about their high standards. Thus, the higher the ranking of the institution is, the less frequently realized the QUANTITY metaphor is. This metaphor has not been found in the mission statements of four universities, namely, Oxford, Cambridge, Madrid, and Porto, whereas this metaphor is frequently evoked in the missions of the other 16 institutions. This can be explained by a conscious effort to create and present a positive image as based on numbers. Consider how positive self-presentation is construed through the QUANTITY metaphor in Table 3.

As illustrated in Table 3, the QUANTITY metaphor is absent in the mission statements of Oxford, Cambridge, Madrid, and Porto universities, which can be positively interpreted, for the quality is not quantified. The QUANTITY metaphor has an ideological power to imply about the importance of hierarchical relations and commoditization in society and education. There is also a case where this metaphor is predominantly evoked, that is, Lomonosov University. This kind of property ideology, as construed by the QUANTITY metaphor, negatively characterizes the narrative framing of that institution. It should also be noted that in most cases, this metaphor is used explicitly, that is, through numbers, with the purpose display power relations of a certain institution. However, there are instances of less explicit realization of this metaphor, that is, through the use of nouns or verbs related to quantity or measurement. In all cases, the QUANTITY metaphor creates a property ideology, where the institution is presented as a commodity in the market of education.

In addition, the metaphorical framing of the QUANTITY metaphor is supported by the COMPETITION metaphor. The numbers provided in the mission statements are related to the competitive potential of an institution. In other words, if the numbers are high, the institutions are seen as sufficiently competitive. As a result, in many instances, these two metaphors are evoked simultaneously in one sentence. Consider the metaphorical usages of the QUANTITY metaphor (i.e., underlined) in combination with the COMPETITION metaphor (i.e., in bold) in (66) and (67).

(66) As a world-leading centre of academic excellence we aim to: enhance our position as one of the world’s leading research and teaching universities and to measure our performance against the highest international standards . . . . (Edinburgh)

(67) Numerous projects that are being funded and have been funded by Germany’s central research funding agency (DFG) clearly demonstrate our research potential and strong commitment to achieving academic excellence. (Bonn)

The COMPETITION metaphor is realized by such linguistic units as leading, excellence, or highest standards in (66), and potential, strong, or excellence in (67). All these are related to the semantic domain of competition, as their basic meaning has the component of competitive superiority. The most prevalent adjective used in the context of the COMPETITION metaphor is “leading”; the basic meaning of which originates from the domain of war or fighting. The COMPETITION metaphor becomes more effective in combination with the semantic domain of QUANTITY, realized by such linguistic units as “enhance,” “measure” in (66), and “numerous” in (67).

The COMPETITION metaphor does not only complement the QUANTITY metaphoric frame, but it is also evoked autonomously. Let us consider how the clarifications of the COMPETITION metaphor are exemplified by the following metaphorical usages in (68) and (69) below:

(68) Heidelberg University will strengthen and extend its cooperation with non-university research institutions. . . . Occupying a leading position in Germany and in Europe, the University is committed to providing its global competitiveness. (Heidelberg)

(69) The University of Helsinki is one of the leading research universities in the world. Our multidisciplinary research has made us one of the key players in solving global problems. (Helsinki)

The above examples illustrate the linguistic realization of the COMPETITION metaphor through such units as “strengthen,” “leading,” “competitiveness,” and “players.” The concept of strength, as evoked by the verb “strengthen” in (68), is significant for competition, as being “strong” is essential in competing for the status of the “best” university. Other uses also support the metaphoric construal of a university as a competitor. What can be learned from this metaphoric framing is that activities of higher education are presented through the prism of competitiveness, and where quality is associated with quantity. The use of such metaphors evokes the following assumptions: to be successful one has to compete; competitiveness is sustained by strength, leadership, and self-interest (i.e., the COMMERCE metaphor); and its quality is guaranteed by quantity. These are essential features associated with the moral authority. This modeling is similar to the Strict Father morality or conservative ideology, as described by Lakoff (1996, 2006). The cognitive structures of the Strict Father model can be paralleled with free-market economics where the pursuit of self-interest (i.e., becoming a leader, competing for leadership) is of primary concern. These characteristics can be traced in the metaphorical usages of the QUANTITY and COMPETITION metaphors.

Conclusion

The CMA of the mission statements of the first 20 European universities, according to the Webometrics ranking, has
Table 3. The Frequency of the Metaphoric Usage of the QUALITY IS QUANTITY Metaphor.

| R  | Universities                                                   | F | Examples                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | University of Oxford                                           | — | —                                                                                                           | UCL is **one of the top two** universities in the United Kingdom. In 2011-2012 alone, UCL supported the creation of **34 new student businesses**. |
| 2  | University of Cambridge                                        | — | —                                                                                                           |                                                                                                           |
| 3  | University College London (UCL)                                 | 2 | UCL is **one of the top two** universities in the United Kingdom. In 2011-2012 alone, UCL supported the creation of **34 new student businesses**. |
| 4  | Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich                    | 4 | **21 Nobel Laureates** have studied, taught, or conducted research at ETH Zurich, underlining the excellent reputation of the institute. It does this very successfully, as borne out by the **80 new patent applications** each year and some **260 spin-off companies** that emerged from the institute between 1996 and 2012. |
| 5  | University of Edinburgh                                        | 3 | **Enhance our position** as one of the world’s leading research and teaching universities and **to measure our performance** against the highest international standards . . . |
| 6  | Utrecht University                                             | 2 | Utrecht University offers **52 bachelor’s and 178 master’s degree programs**, many of them English-taught. The University is home to **30,344 students and 7,500 staff**. |
| 7  | University of Vienna                                           | 6 | Currently, about **92,500 students** are enrolled at the University of Vienna. **187 courses can be taken**, of which **55 are bachelor programs, 116 master programs, 4 Diploma Programs, and 12 PhD programs.** |
| 8  | Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL)                 | 4 | EPFL is Europe’s **most cosmopolitan technical university**. It receives students, professors, and staff from **over 120 nationalities** launch of **joint or double degrees**. |
| 9  | Heidelberg University                                          | 3 | **Occupying a leading position** in Germany and in Europe, the University . . . will continue to **increase its attractiveness** for outstanding international scholars and students and to **expand its international networks**. |
| 10 | University of Amsterdam (UvA)                                  | 7 | Today, with some **30,000 students, 5,000 staff** and a budget of more than **600 million euros**, it is one of the **largest comprehensive universities in Europe**. Over time, the UvA has **risen to** international prominence as a research university, **gaining an excellent reputation** in both fundamental and socially relevant research. |
| 11 | The Complutense University of Madrid                            | — | —                                                                                                           |                                                                                                           |
| 12 | Sapienza University of Rome                                     | 4 | Sapienza offers a vast array of courses including degree programs, PhD courses . . . run by **63 departments** and **11 faculties**. With the 2011-2012 academic year, some 8,000 **foreign students** are regularly enrolled at Sapienza. |
| 13 | University of Copenhagen                                       | 8 | The University of Copenhagen is **the largest educational institution in Denmark**. Together, the **six faculties offer more than 200 programs** for study in health and medical sciences, humanities, law, science, social sciences, and theology. The University aims to prepare students for a **broad range of jobs** in the private and public sectors. |
| 14 | University of Helsinki EU                                       | 4 | In 2004, the University’s research funding totalled **€178 million**. There are **35,000 degree students**. Approximately **4,500 master’s degrees** and almost **500 doctorates** are carried out each year. |
| 15 | Lomonosov Moscow State University (MSU)                        | 32| Its undergraduates may choose one of **128 qualifications** in its **39 faculties**, while post-graduate students may specialize in **18 branches of science and humanities** and in **168 different areas**. The total number of MSU students exceeds **40,000**; besides, about 10,000 high school students attend various clubs and courses at MSU. Many more MSU scientists have been awarded various Soviet and Russian prizes for their achievements, among them **60 Lenin Prizes and 120 State Prizes**, **more than 40 MSU scientists** having received the State Prizes over the last decade. |

(continued)
resulted in two prevalent metaphoric clusters: (1) PERSONIFICATION–COMMERCE and (2) QUANTITY–COMPETITION. The metaphoric usages have clarified the overall trend of the traditional conservative ideology underlying the narrative of the mission statements. This ideological pattern is reflected in the conceptualization as follows.

University is perceived as a business person driven by one’s self-interest for competing in the race for supremacy, becoming stronger, and gaining more benefits in terms of the increasing numbers of students, staff, achievements, and so on. The evoked metaphors are of the conservative nature and are based on the positive evaluation of such underlying concepts as strong leadership, competitiveness for superiority, hierarchical relationship, and quantifiable quality. Despite this overall trend, some features of the sustainability approach can be traced through the evoked concepts of tolerance, freedom of speech, and environmental and social concerns.

Overall, the prevailing metaphors fail to popularize the sustainability approach to higher education. The expected transformative change of ideas and values for a just and sustainable development does not recur in the metaphoric usages as a conceptual pattern. What is shared by the recurrent metaphoric expressions is a consumerist attitude to education with its roots in the conservative ideology. Considering the fact that this attitude is prevalent in the mission statements of the first 20 European universities, it can be presumed that a similar approach would be sustained in the mission statements of the institutions of the lower ranking for the sake of following the “leading standards.”

Finally, it should be noted that metaphors allow us to understand both the complexity of perceptions and expectations. The narrative of the universities’ mission statements reflects both the values of a speaker and the expected values of an addressee. The representation of a higher institution in competitive and commercial terms mirrors what the speakers expect from their addressees’ reaction to the provided narrative. Hence, the analysis of the universities’ mission statements is two-functional. First, it shows the level of ideological perceptions of the higher education in academia. Second, it construes what is perceived of the audience’s ideological expectations. This study has demonstrated that the modern narrative of higher education is based on consumerism and property ideology, and this manner of representation is expected to be audience appealing. It might be presumed that both senders and receivers give preference to the more traditional value-system with reference to higher education, which serves as the background for communicating the ‘corporate self’ or ‘corporate brand’ of an institution. In the view of this system, sustainability approach is not conceptualised as a value. The findings shed new light on how the most popular European Universities popularize their image and how that image may not be consistent with the idea of sustainability. This study admittedly has its limitations. Methodologically, the data was analysed without using any corpus-method for generating semantic domains (Deignan 2005; Stefanowitsch 2006), which might provide more empirical evidence for analysing semantic patterns of linguistic metaphor / metaphorical expressions. Addressing these limitations will be the goal of future research on this topic. Despite these limitations, the study offers a cognitive socio-linguistic approach to evaluating metaphor in the mission statements of the most popular EU Universities and provides valuable insights into the ideological nature of higher education ‘identity’ as seen through the narrative of mission statements.
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