

The Metaphors That Elementary School Students use to Describe the Term “Teacher”

Ruhan KARADAĞ¹ & Mehmet GÜLTEKİN²

Abstract: The aim of this study is to investigate metaphors that elementary school 5th and 8th grade students (N=567) use in order to describe the term “teacher”. The data were collected using a questionnaire consisting of open-ended questions, and analyzed using qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques. Content analysis technique was used in the analysis of qualitative data, and chi square was used in quantitative data analysis. According to the results of the study, it was found out that 83 valid metaphors were produced by 429 elementary school students. These metaphors were collected under 6 conceptual headings according to their common features. It was observed that the conceptual categories formed related to the metaphors that elementary school students use have no significant difference according to gender and school levels, but have significant differences related to their classroom levels.

Key Words: Metaphor, Elementary School, Teacher

Özet: İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin “Öğretmen” Kavramına İlişkin Kullandıkları Metaforlar. Bu araştırma ilköğretim 5. ve 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin (N=567) öğretmen kavramına ilişkin sahip oldukları metaforları ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma verileri nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden yarı yapılandırılmış açık uçlu anket formları ile toplanmış; veriler nitel ve nicel veri analizi teknikleri kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Araştırmanın nitel verilerinin analizinde içerik analizi, nicel verilerinin analizinde ise ki kare veri analiz tekniği kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda 429 ilköğretim öğrencisi tarafından öğretmen kavramına ilişkin toplam 83 adet geçerli metafor üretildiği ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu metaforlar ortak özellikleri bakımından altı kavramsal kategori altında toplanmıştır. İlköğretim öğrencilerinin oluşturmuş oldukları metaforlara ilişkin yapılandırılan kavramsal kategoriler öğrencilerin cinsiyetleri ve okul düzeyleri bakımından farklılık göstermezken, sınıf düzeylerine göre anlamlı farklılık ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Metafor, ilköğretim, öğretmen

Introduction

In the 21st century, the continuous change in individual, national and global era causes changes in education concept as well as other areas. Parallel to these changes, constructivist learning approach that focus on student-centered and process oriented understanding gain importance, especially in education.

In constructivist learning approach, activities helping students to be oriented in research individually or in groups, provide them with free thinking and improve their creativity carry the importance. In this respect, metaphorical thinking has been considered as an approach that aims to improve the students' critical and creative thinking abilities (Arslan and Bayrakçı, 2006, p.101). Metaphor, which is seen as a tool to create reality (Perry and Cooper, 2001, p.43) has been described as “relating abstract concepts with concrete things (Saban, 2004, p.618). Lakoff and Johnson (2005) describe the metaphor concept as understanding or experiencing facts, concepts or objects according to something else. Using metaphors is to help individuals compare abstract and vague concepts to experienced ones, and with the help of these to create an understanding against unknown concepts (Saban, Koçbeker & Saban, 2002). As the function of metaphors is “understanding”, metaphors are used as important tools in education for teaching-learning applications and reflecting thoughts (Woon and Ho, 2005). Recently, metaphors have been used as tools for educational processes in pre-service teacher education, teaching practices, and on students in the classrooms (Berman et. al. 2006). There are numerous benefits of the use of metaphors in educational settings. According to this, metaphors:

- Help to relate new information with previously learned ones (Grainger, Barnes & Scoffham, 2004, p.247; Indurkha, 1992; Petrie & Oshlag, 1993; Kadunz & Sträßer, 2004, p.244; James, 2002, p.26); thus, helps to understand them concretely (Senemoğlu, 2004, p.564; Yung, 2001, p.252; Chen, 2003).
- Help students to focus and create new understanding (Jessel, 2000, p.8).

¹ Ruhan KARADAĞ, Yrd.Doç.Dr., Adıyaman Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Türkçe Eğitimi Bölümü, Adıyaman, e-posta: rkaradag@adiyaman.edu.tr

² Mehmet GÜLTEKİN, Doç.Dr., Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İlköğretim Bölümü, Eskişehir, e-posta: mgulteki@anadolu.edu.tr

THE METAPHORS THAT STUDENTS USE TO DESCRIBE THE TERM “TEACHER”

- Help students to construct concepts efficiently, use previously learned information by recovering them, and to relate them to other information (Oğuz, 2005, p.584).
- Make an issue or case easier, more understandable, and summarize and simplify it (Mackinnon, 2004, p.400; Ganser, 1994, p.1).
- Help to illuminate a less known subject with a well known subject (Grainger, Barners and Scoffham, 2004, p.247; Sumsion, 2002, p.870).
- Help individuals who create the metaphors to evaluate education programs (Kemp, 1999; Patton, 2002, s.95), and help education to be improved (James, 2002, s.26).
- Help teachers to reflect their beliefs against educational processes (Wright et al. 2002, p.5) and their studies (Ganser, 1994, p.1).
- Help to be informed about sophisticated concepts as learning, teaching, and instructing, to understand personal experiences of individuals (Stichert, 2005, p.2).
- By helping individuals express themselves freely, and construct their own thoughts in a more detailed manner (Inkson, 2004, p.97; Kemp, 1999), help them improve and evaluate their skills to express their positive or negative experiences clearly (Kemp, 1999).

The use of metaphors in education carries a great importance for professional development of the educators, and educational applications as well. It is possible for teachers to reflect and improve their applications and thoughts by using metaphors. By helping teachers to reflect their applications in order to implement their teaching more efficiently, and to understand their roles and responsibilities in the classroom, metaphors assist them to chance and improve their in-class applications (Clarken, 1997, 3-4; Kasoutas & Malamitsa, 2009, p.79; Celikten, 2006, p.277). Together with describing student and teacher roles in educational area, metaphors are used as cognitive tools in revealing hypothesis related to teaching and learning concepts (Ben-Peretz, Mendelson & Kron, 2003; Bullough, 1991, 1992; Bullough et. al., 1992; Calderhead & Robson, 1991) and teachers’ attitudes related to theories they choose, their philosophical tendencies, roles, and their teaching applications (Saban, 2004, 621-622).

This study aims to reveal personal and professional characteristics that teachers have with the help of determining the metaphors that students use for the term “teacher”, and thus, bringing out the perception they have for the mentioned term. These perceptions are important to put forth the characteristics that teachers have, and to take attention to these characteristics in teacher education. Moreover, the findings of this study are also important in order that they would add for the research literature in this subject.

The Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to reveal the perceptions of elementary school 5th and 8th grade students related with the term “teacher” through metaphors. With this general aim in mind, answers for the following questions will be answered:

- Which metaphors (simile, image, etc) do students use to reveal their perceptions about the term “teacher?”
- Which categories could the metaphors that elementary school students’ use related to the term “teacher” be collected under?
- Do the metaphors that elementary school students have differ according to classroom level, gender, and school level?

Methodology

Research Model

This study which aims to reveal the metaphors that elementary school students use in order to explain the term “teacher” has been conducted using qualitative and quantitative research methods in survey model.

Participants

This study has been conducted on 5th and 8th grade elementary school students who were in elementary schools tied to Eskisehir National Education Management. Since the universe of the study is very big, sampling method has been used. In the sampling process, one of the cluster sampling methods, proportional cluster sampling method has been used. To be able to form proportional clusters sub-universes have been formed since they would create important differences about research findings. In this respect, to form the sampling of the study 3 elementary schools per socio-economical level as high, middle and low level in has been determined. All the sample schools were tied to Eskisehir National Education

Management. Among these schools 1 class from 5th grades and 1 class from 8th grades have been chosen, and the study has been conducted with 18 classes (9 from 5th grades, and 9 from 8th grades). Table 1 shows the classroom levels and the schools of the participants of the study.

Table.1: *The Characteristics of Participants*

Gender	f	%
Female (F)	297	52.4
Male (M)	270	47.6
Total	567	100
Classroom Level	f	%
5th. Grade	320	56.4
8th. Grade	247	43.6
Total	567	100
School	f	%
Y.E. Elementary School	72	12.7
N.K. Elementary School	66	11.6
24 K. Elementary School	62	10.9
M.G. Elementary School	70	12.3
Ş.A.G. O. Elementary School	71	12.5
AV.M. B. Elementary School	42	7.4
P.B. A.T. Elementary School	65	11.5
K. Elementary School	58	10.2
G. Elementary School	61	10.8
Total	567	100
Whether They Used Metaphors	f	%
Yes	429	75.7
No	138	24.3
Total	567	100

As seen in Table 1, of the 567 students 297 (52.4%) were females, and 270 (47.6%) were males. When percentages and frequencies of classroom levels of the participants students are analyzed, the number of the students in 5th grade appears to be 320 (56.4%), and in 8th grade appears to be 247 (43.6%). When metaphor forming characteristics related to the term “teacher” of the students are analyzed, it is seen that while 429 (75.7%) of the students used metaphors, 138 (24.3%) of them could not fill in the metaphors as expected.

Data Collection

Data were collected using a questionnaire consisting of open-ended questions to determine the metaphors that elementary school 5th and 8th grade students form related to the term “teacher”. In the questionnaire, two questions were directed to students in order to collect information related to the students’ classroom level and gender. In order to determine the perceptions of the participant students related to the term “teacher”, they were asked to complete sentences like “Teacher is like....Because ...” For this purpose each student was given a blank sheet with the mentioned phrase, and was asked to write about their thoughts only focusing on one metaphor.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

In the analysis of the collected data, qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques were used. In the analysis of the metaphors that elementary school students formed in order to determine their thoughts about the term “teacher”, first of all “content analysis” technique was used. Data which were analyzed through content analysis in accordance with the purposes of the study were then computed using the SPSS. 567 students were asked to write metaphors in the study, but only the metaphors which were written by 429 students were evaluated. The rest 138 students’ questionnaires were not taken into evaluation since although some of the students formed metaphors, they did not explain the reason; some students could not explain logical reasons for their metaphors; and some did not fill in the questionnaire as expected. The analysis and interpretation process of the metaphors formed by students were conducted in steps as

THE METAPHORS THAT STUDENTS USE TO DESCRIBE THE TERM “TEACHER”

“naming”, “classification (elimination and clarification), “re-organize and re-collection”, “categorization”, and “loading into SPSS program for quantitative data analysis”.

In *naming* step, metaphors that were formed by each student were coded, and questionnaires where nothing was written on and where no metaphors were found were eliminated. In *classification (elimination and clarification)* step, using metaphor analysis and content analysis techniques, each metaphor created by students was read and evaluated, and according to similarities and common points with other metaphors, they were analyzed. In *re-organize and re-collection* step, student-created metaphors about the term “teacher” were organized, and 83 valid metaphors were determined. Thus, a metaphor list has been formed. In *categorization* step, 6 conceptual categories were determined with the help of metaphor utterances indicated by students were formed. Each metaphor, in accordance with sample metaphor list which was formed for this purpose, was evaluated according to the teacher roles they represent, and coded (for example, the source of information, mentor, molder, etc.). After these steps were all completed, to test the reliability of the study, metaphors that students used while answering the open-ended questions were determined by another rater other than the researchers of the study. The metaphors collected were introduced as “agreement”, and “disagreement”. To compute the reliability of the study, P (Agreement Percentage) = $[Na \text{ (Agreement)} / Na \text{ (Agreement)} + Nd \text{ (Disagreement)}] \times 100$ formula introduced by Miles and Huberman (1994) was used, and P = 93.10 value was acquired, thus the study was accepted reliable. In *loading the data into SPSS program for quantitative data analysis* step, after identifying 429 metaphors and forming 6 conceptual categories that these metaphors form, first of all, students number (f) and percentages (%) were calculated. Then, “Pearson Chi-square test” was applied in order to evaluate whether the appearing categories differ according to gender, classroom level, and school level of the students.

The collected data were summarized and interpreted according to the metaphors that students used in explaining the term “teacher”. The data were introduced in tables with their frequencies and percentages; direct quotations were made from student opinions.

Findings

In the study, first of all answer for the question “Which metaphors (simile, image, etc) do students use to reveal their perceptions about the term “teacher?” The metaphors created by students were introduced in Table 2.

As seen in Table 2, by 429 students participated in the study, a total of 83 metaphors were created. Although the rest 138 students created metaphors, some did not explain the reason, did not give logical reasons for their metaphors, or instead of forming metaphors, explained what a teacher is, thus these were eliminated from the study.

The mostly used metaphor that elementary school students formed relate to teacher is “mother-father” (146). Together with this, other common metaphors are; “friend” (44), “light” (34), “angel” (26), and “sun” (25). Moreover, “family” (9), “flower” (9), “book” (8), “candle” (6), “gardener” (6), “information machine” (5), “lantern” (4), “torch” (4), and “light bulb” (4) are among other metaphors that students produced.

Table 2: *Frequencies and Percentages Related to Metaphors Created by Elementary School Students*

<i>Metaphor Name</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Metaphor Name</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Metaphor Name</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Ant	5	,9	Information Machine	5	,9	Lamp/Light bulb	4	,7
Mother-Father	146	25,7	Water	3	,5	Discriminatory Professor	1	,2
Family	9	1,6	Door Key	1	,2	A ready to Explode Bomb	1	,2
Angel	26	4,6	Treasure	1	,2	Lighter	1	,2
Information Device	1	,2	Sea	1	,2	Information Box	1	,2
Compass	2	,4	Cook	1	,2	The Angel of Death	3	,5
Ninja	2	,4	Lifeguard	1	,2	Television	1	,2
Candle	6	1,1	Sculptor	2	,4	Friend	44	7,7

Table 2: *Devam*

Doctor	2	,4	Lantern	4	,7	Source of Information	1	,2
Dictionary	1	,2	Sophist	2	,4	Hot and Sweet meal	1	,2
Mirror	5	,9	Computer	3	,5	Hot Chocolate	1	,2
Sibling	1	,2	Fruit Giving Tree	1	,2	Leading Bird	1	,2
Firefly	4	,7	Moon	1	,2	Shepherd	1	,2
Flower	5	,9	Confidant	2	,4	Rubik's Cube	1	,2
Light	34	5,9	Information Waterfall	1	,2	Chocolate Ice-Cream	1	,2
Buddy	1	,2	Chameleon	1	,2	Football Player	1	,2
Enemy of illiteracy	1	,2	Map	1	,2	Mother Duck	1	,2
Plant	1	,2	Guide	1	,2	Porter	1	,2
Tree	2	,4	Music	2	,2	Sapling	1	,2
Lighthouse	1	,2	Cat	2	,4	Bee	1	,2
Source of Light	2	,4	Rubber	1	,2	White Light	1	,2
Sun	25	4,4	Ataturk	1	,2	Farmer	1	,2
Rose	3	,5	Shepherd's Dog	1	,2	Artist	1	,2
Psychologist	3	,5	Gardener	6	1,1	Blank	138	24,3
Book	8	1,4	Police	2	,4			
Beating Machine	1	,2	Fire	1	,2			
Architect	1	,2	Captain	1	,2			
Star	1	,2	Information Robot	3	,5			
Road	1	,2	Torch	4	,7			
Mother Goose	1	,2	Bug	1	,2			

Table 3: *Frequencies and Percentages of the Metaphor Categories According to School and Classroom Level, and Gender*

<i>CATEGORIES</i>																
<i>Levels of schools</i>			<i>Information providing</i>		<i>Guiding, directing, and protecting</i>		<i>Shaping</i>		<i>Supporting personal improvement</i>		<i>Source of happiness</i>		<i>Getting reaction/negative image</i>		<i>Blank</i>	
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%				
Low Level	5.grade (F)	6	%11.1	41	%15.4	-	-	5	%6.3	-	-	-	-	11	%7.9	
	(M)	1	%.1.9	30	%11.2	1	%8.3	7	%8.8	-	-	-	-	5	%3.6	
8.grade	(F)	2	%3.7	14	%5.3	-	-	18	%22.5	1	%25.0	-	-	16	%11.6	
	(M)	-	-	16	%6.0	-	-	4	%5.0	1	%25.0	1	%7.7	11	%7.9	
Middle Level	5.grade (F)	1	%1.9	36	%13.5	1	%8.3	6	%7.5	-	-	1	%7.7	11	%7.9	
	(M)	2	%3.7	28	%10.5	-	-	3	%3.8	-	-	-	-	21	%15.4	
8.grade	(F)	5	%9.3	18	%6.8	-	-	2	%2.5	-	-	2	%15.4	15	%11.1	
	(M)	4	%7.4	17	%6.4	-	-	1	%1.2	2	%50.0	2	%15.4	20	%14.7	
High Level	5.grade (F)	8	%14.8	20	%7.5	4	%41.7	11	%13.7	-	-	-	-	6	%4.3	
	(M)	10	%18.5	24	%9.0	2	%8.3	8	%10.0	-	-	4	%30.8	4	%2.9	
8.grade	(F)	6	%11.1	9	%3.5	2	%16.7	6	%7.5	-	-	-	-	10	%7.2	
	(M)	9	%16.7	13	%4.8	2	%16.7	9	%11.2	-	-	3	%23.0	8	%5.8	
Total		54	%100	266	%100	12	%100	80	%100	4	%100	13	%100	138	%100	

THE METAPHORS THAT STUDENTS USE TO DESCRIBE THE TERM “TEACHER”

To answer the question “Which categories could the metaphors that elementary school students’ use related to the term “teacher” be collected under?” which composes the second aim of the study, first of all, logical basis which were claimed by the elementary school students were analyzed. Then, these metaphors were collected under 6 categories related to their common characteristics. The categories related to formed metaphors were; “*information providing*”, “*guiding, directing, and protecting*”, “*shaping*”, “*supporting personal improvement*”, “*source of happiness*”, and “*getting reaction/negative image*”, according to the socio-economical level of the schools. Frequencies and percentages of these metaphor categories are given in Table 3 according to school and classroom level, and gender.

As seen in Table 3, it is observed that 5th and 8th grade students having high socio-economical level in “information providing” category related to the metaphors concerning the term “teacher” created more metaphors. Most of the students who perceive teacher as “guiding, directing and protecting” consist of 5th grade female (15.3%) and male (11.2%) at low socio-economical level, and 5th grade female (14.2%) students at middle socio-economical level. Students who perceive teacher as “shaping” consist of 5th grade female (41.7%) students studying at high socio-economical level schools. Students, who created metaphors under “supporting personal improvement” category, study at both low and high socio-economical level schools. 22.8% of the students in this category are from low socio-economical level female students. As in Table 3, the number of the students who perceive teacher as “source of happiness” is smaller than other categories. Students who perceive teacher as “source of happiness” study at low socio-economical level schools and consist of 8th grade female (50%) students. Most of the students who think teacher is “getting reaction/negative image” are 5th grade male (35.7%) students studying at high socio-economical level schools.

The distribution of metaphors under “information providing” category according to gender and classroom levels is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: *Frequencies and Percentage Distribution of the Metaphors Created by Students Who Perceive Teacher as “Information Providing”*

<i>Metaphor</i>	<i>5. grade</i>				<i>8. grade</i>			
	<i>F</i>		<i>M</i>		<i>F</i>		<i>M</i>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Dictionary					1	7.7		
Mirror			1	7.7	4	30.7		
Flower	2	13,3	1	7.7			2	16,8
Enemy of Illiteracy							1	8,3
Plant							1	8,3
Tree	1	6,7			1	7.7		
Source of Information			1	7.7				
Rose	2	13,3					1	8,3
Book	3	20,0	3	23.1	1	7.7	1	8,3
Information Machine			3	23.1			2	16,8
Water			1	7,7	1	7.7	1	8,3
Door Key	1	6,7						
Treasure							1	8,3
Sea							1	8,3
Sophist	1	6,7	1	7.7				
Computer	2	13,3			1	7.7		
Fruit Giving Tree					1	7.7		
Information Robot	1	6,7	1	7,7	1	7.7		
Information Waterfall					1	7.7		
Sapling					1	7.7		
Bee			1	7.7				
Information Device	1	6,7						
Information Box	1	6,7						
Television							1	8,3
Doctor	1	1,0						
Total	16	100,0	13	100,0	13	100,0	12	100,0

As seen in Table 4, there are 25 metaphors under “information providing” category. Most important of these metaphors appear to be “flower”, “book”, and “information machine”. Examples of metaphor definitions are provided below:

Teacher is like a “dictionary”. Because whenever a student opens a new page, he or she learns new information from him, and his or her knowledge advances (YE, 8F 7).

Teacher is like a “tree”. Because first, he himself grows, improves and stores information. Then he gives information just like the fruits of a tree. He feeds us with those information (YE, 8F 36).

Teacher is like a “door key” that we should open for our lives. He transfers a lot of information that we will need (GK, 5F 35).

Teacher is like a “doctor”. He vaccinates information to protect us from illiteracy (YE, 8F 6).

The distribution of metaphors under “guiding, directing, and protecting” category according to gender and classroom levels is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Frequencies and Percentage Distribution of the Metaphors Created by Students Who Perceive Teacher as “Guiding, Directing, and Protecting”

Metaphor	5. grade				8. grade			
	F		M		F		M	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Ant			3	3,7	1	2,5	1	2,2
Mother-Father	61	61,7	56	68,3	10	24,5	18	39,1
Family	3	3,1	2	2,4	3	7,4	1	2,2
Compass							2	4,3
Ninja							2	4,3
Candle	4	4,0	1	1,2	1	2,5		
Sibling							1	2,2
Firefly					1	2,5	3	6,5
Light	13	13,1	11	13,5	6	15,8	4	8,7
Lighthouse							1	2,2
Sun	8	8,1	5	6,1	8	19,8	4	8,7
Lifeguard							1	2,2
Lantern	2	2,0	1	1,2	1	2,5		
Moon					1	2,5		
Map					1	2,5		
Guide					1	2,5		
Ataturk							1	2,2
Shepherd’s Dog					1	2,5		
Police	2	2,0						
Fire			1	1,2				
Captain			1	1,2				
Torch							4	8,7
Source of Light	1	1,0					1	2,2
White Light					1	2,5		
Hot and Sweet							1	2,2
Lamp/Light bulb	2	2,0	1	1,2	1	2,5		
Star	1	1,0						
Road	1	1,0						
Mother Goose					1	2,5		
Mother Duck					1	2,5		
Leading Bird					1	2,5		
Shepherd							1	2,2
Total	98	100.0	82	100.0	40	100.0	46	100.0

THE METAPHORS THAT STUDENTS USE TO DESCRIBE THE TERM “TEACHER”

As seen in Table 5, there are 32 metaphors under “guiding, directing, and protecting” category. “Mother-father” metaphor takes the first place among the metaphors forming this category. Among the mostly created metaphors, there are also “light”, “sun”, “family” and “candle”. Examples of metaphor definitions are provided below:

Teacher is like “the sun”. Because he is a sun for the students who are like planets. He illuminates our dark inner sides (PBAT, 8M, 29).

Teacher is like a “map”. Because he shows the way to students to help them choose schools, careers, etc. where they will be happy and which is the most suitable for them (MG, 6F, 6).

Teacher is like a “shepherd”. Because a classroom is like a herd. Teacher is the leader of the herd. He directs us and shows us the way (AMB, 5M, 15).

The distribution of metaphors under “shaping” category according to gender and classroom levels is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Frequencies and Percentage Distribution of the Metaphors Created by Students Who Perceive Teacher as “Shaping”

Metaphor	5.grade				8.grade			
	F		M		F		M	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Architect	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	-	-
Cook	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	50,0
Sculptor	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	1	50,0
Gardener	5	100,0	1	33.3	-	-	-	-
Farmer	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	-	-
Artist	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	-	-
Total	5	100,0	3	100,0	2	100,0	2	100,0

As seen in Table 6, there are 6 metaphors under “shaping” category. The most common metaphor under this category is “gardener”. Examples of metaphor definitions are provided below:

Teacher is like a “sculptor”. He carves the students as a sculptor do and teach them important knowledge. He decorates us with information and shapes us (GK, 8M, 17).

Teacher is like an “artist”. Everything starts in the kindergarten. They teach cooperation first. Then, to share. As we grow up, the way to shape us changes. Shaping do not end as in play dough. Classes begin in the primary school. With patience and devotion, they explain everything, they steal from their own lives for us. Just like an artist does (SAGO, 8F, 24).

Teacher is like a “gardener”. They plant us first, and raise us with love (AMB, 5F, 20).

The distribution of metaphors under “supporting personal improvement” category according to gender and classroom levels is presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Frequencies and Percentage Distribution of the Metaphors Created by Students Who Perceive Teacher as “Supporting Personal Improvement”

Metaphor	5.grade				8.grade			
	F		M		F		M	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Angel	8	36,4	7	38.8	6	23.1	7	50.0
Buddy	-	-	-	-	1	3.8	-	-
Psychologist	-	-	1	5.6	2	7.7	-	-
Confidant	1	4,5	1	5.6	-	-	-	-
Porter	-	-	-	-	1	3.8	-	-
Rubik’s Cube	1	4,5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Friend	12	54,6	9	50.0	16	61.6	7	50,0
Total	22	100,0	18	100,0	26	100,0	14	100,0

As seen in Table 7, a total number of 8 metaphors appear under “supporting personal improvement” category. The most common metaphor under this category is “friend”. This metaphor is followed by “angel”, and “psychologist”. Examples of metaphor definitions are provided below:

Teacher is like a “psychologist”. He listens to our problems, tells us the solution, stays with us when we are sad, comforts us, gives us peace (NK, 5M,26).

Teacher is like a “porter”. The responsibilities of the students are so heavy that he should be a porter to carry them (AMB, 5F, 10).

Teacher is like a “friend”. We can share our discomfort and problems with them (GO, 5M, 29).

The distribution of metaphors under “source of happiness” category according to gender and classroom levels is presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Frequencies and Percentage Distribution of the Metaphors Created by Students Who Perceive Teacher as “Source of Happiness”*

Metaphor	5.grade				8.grade			
	F		M		F		M	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Music	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	75.0
Chocolate Ice-cream	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25.0
Hot Chocolate	-	-	-	-	1	100,0	-	-
Total	-	100,0	-	100,0	1	100,0	3	100,0

As seen in Table 8, 3 metaphors were created under “source of happiness” category. The metaphors forming this category are “music”, “chocolate ice-cream”, and “hot chocolate”. Examples of metaphor definitions are provided below:

Teacher is like “music”. It is beautiful when it is fast. It bores me when it is slow. When they both repeat the same things over and over again, they lose their efficiency, and quality. Music is beautiful when it is suitable to one’s mood and psychology. Teacher is the same (MGO, 8M, 16).

Teacher is like “hot chocolate”. Hot chocolate is a warm and sweet drink. Teacher is also warm towards us (PBAT, 8F, 28).

The distribution of metaphors under “getting reaction/negative image” category according to gender and classroom levels is presented in Table 9.

Table 9. *Frequencies and Percentage Distribution of The Metaphors Created by Students Who Perceive Teacher as “Getting Reaction/Negative Image”*

Metaphor	5.grade				8.grade			
	F		M		F		M	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Beating Machine	-	-	1	25,0	-	-	-	-
Bug	-	-	1	25,0	-	-	-	-
Discriminator y Professor	-	-	1	25,0	-	-	-	-
A ready to Explode Bomb	-	-	1	25,0	-	-	-	-
Chameleon	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	-	-
Cat	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	1	16,7
Rubber	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	16,7
The Angel of Death	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50,0
Football Player	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	16,7
Lighter	1	100,0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1	100,0	4	100,0	2	100,0	6	100,0

THE METAPHORS THAT STUDENTS USE TO DESCRIBE THE TERM “TEACHER”

As seen in Table 9, 13 metaphors were created under “getting reaction/negative image” category. The most common metaphor under this category is “the angel of death”. Together with this, there are also “beating machine”, “bug”, “discriminatory professor”, chameleon”, “cat”, “football player”, and “lighter” metaphors. Examples of metaphor definitions are provided below:

Teacher is like a “beating machine”. Some teacher beat us bad (GK, 5F, 2).

Teacher is like a “discriminatory professor”. He is in favor of girls (GK, 5M, 23).

Teacher is like “the angel of death” he obeys the orders of the principal. Make us write and do not let us in Physical Education lessons (SAGO, 8M, 18).

Teacher is like a “chameleon”. His mood changes from day to day (MG, 8F, 5).

Teacher is like a “cat”. You cannot ever trust him, and he is ungrateful (MG, 8F, 21).

Teacher is like a “football player”. Sometimes his performance goes down, and his courses turn boring (PBAT, 8M, 26).

Teacher is like a “ready to explode bomb”. He is sometimes very angry (GK, 5M, 24).

The third aim of the study is formed by the question “Do the metaphors that elementary school students have differ according to classroom level, gender, and school level?” in order to test if there are significant differences between the metaphor categories formed by elementary school 5th and 8th grade students with classroom level, gender and school level, “pearson chi-square test” was applied. According to the results of the analysis, while there is no significant statistical differences between gender of the students X^2 (sd=6, N=567)=6,83; $p > 0,05$), and the socio-economical levels of the schools they study X^2 (sd=6, N=567)=80.14; $p > 0,05$); there is a significant difference between their classroom level and metaphor categories they formed concerning the term “teacher”. Table 10 introduces classroom levels and the metaphors the students created about the term “teacher”.

Table 10. Classroom Levels of The Students and Metaphor Categories

CLASS	CATEGORIES							Total
	Information providing	Guiding, directing, and protecting	Shaping	Supporting personal improvement	Source of happiness	Getting reaction/negative image	Blank	
5th GRADE								
f	28	180	8	40	-	5	56	320
%	51.9	67.7	66.7	%50	-	42.9	40.6	56.4
8th GRADE								
f	26	86	4	40	4	9	82	247
%	48.1	32.3	33.3	%50	100	57.1	59.4	43.6
TOTAL								
f	54	266	12	80	4	13	138	567
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

X^2 (sd=6, N=567)=34.18, $p < .05$

According to the values in Table 10, there is a significant relation between classroom levels of the students and categories formed related to the term teacher ($X^2=34.18$, $p < .05$). In other words there is a relation between classroom levels of the students and the metaphor categories they attributed to the concept of teacher. While metaphors for both classroom levels are collected mostly under “guiding, directing and protecting” category, it is observed that 5th grade students formed more metaphors (67.5%) in “guiding, directing and protecting” category than 8th grade students (32.5%). On the other hand, while all 8th grade students (100%) perceive teacher as “source of happiness”, no 5th grade students (0%) does.

Discussion

At the end of the study aiming to determine the metaphors that elementary school students use in order to describe the term “teacher”, it was revealed that the metaphors about teacher are centered under “guiding, directing and protecting”, and “information providing” categories more. This finding of the study is parallel to findings of Saban, Kocbeker and Saban (2007) as “teachers were perceived as source and distributor of information”, and of Cerit’s (2008) as “63.2% of all the students agreed with the judgment that teachers are source and distributor of information”. It is also observed that the students who participated in the study formed metaphors like “flower, book, tree, computer, information machine,

doctor, water, dictionary, television, etc.”. These metaphors are mentioned in the literature related to the field very much. The most common metaphors to define teacher as “providing information” in the literature are *flower* (Stichert, 2005; Gillis and Johnson, 2002; Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007), *book* (Gillis and Johnson, 2002; Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007), *tree* (Nikitina and Furuoka, 2008; Parvaresh, 2008; Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007), *computer* (Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007), *doctor* (Nikitina and Furuoka, 2008; Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007; Celikten, 2006; Stichert, 2005), *water* (Parvaresh, 2008), *dictionary* (Nikitina and Furuoka, 2008), and *television* (De Guerrero and Villamil, 2001; Saban, Koçbeker & Saban, 2007).

The flower metaphor gives an impression that primary school students' perceptions of themselves as a bee. Like the bees obtain the nectar from flowers, students obtain the knowledge and information from teachers. In addition, students using the tree metaphor when defining the teachers show that they perceive themselves in the form of fruit trees as well. Defining teacher concept using “doctor” metaphor reflects teacher’s role as healing illnesses and correcting mistakes. Using “doctor” metaphor in defining teacher concept takes attention to doctor-patient and teacher-student relations. According to Clarken (1997, p.10) teachers should know how to heal their students’ mental and characteristic inadequacies, and should offer teaching activities in relation to this. Teacher should also know “what” to teach along with “how” to teach it. As a doctor should be informed about the causes of illnesses and human body, a teacher should know how students learn best and how learning is improved, and how learning inadequacies could be corrected as well. In this respect, the elementary school students’ use of “doctor” metaphor in defining teacher concept shows that they take attention to information providing role of the teacher, and the teacher should take precautions in order not to have his students experience learning inadequacies.

Most of the students who participated in the study perceive teacher as “guiding, directing and protecting”. In the studies conducted by Saban (2004), and Keiko and Gaies (2002), and Ganser (1994), it is claimed that metaphors have been created about the teacher’s role of directing and supporting improvement.

Most of the students who participated in the study used “mother-father, ant, firefly, sun, candle, lantern, torch, lamp, map, shepherd’s dog, and captain” metaphors in “guiding, directing and protecting” category while defining teacher concept. There are also studies in literature claiming that the most common metaphors are “mother-father” about teacher concept (Kasoutas and Malamitsa, 2009; Nikitina and Furuoka, 2008; Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007; Çelikten, 2006; Darn and White, 2005; Stichert, 2005; Saban, 2004; Gillis and Johnson, 2002; Ganser, 1994; Cereseto, 2010). Together with this *sun* (Nikitina and Furuoka, 2008; Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007; Gillis and Johnson, 2002; De Guerrero and Villamil, 2001), *candle* (Parvaresh, 2008; Zhou and Heineken, 2008; Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007), *lamp* (Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007), *map* (Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007), *compass* (Saban, Koçbeker and Saban, 2007; Saban, 2004; Gillis and Johnson, 2002), *shepherd’s dog* (Snow, 1973; akt: Berliner, 1990), and *captain* (Kasoutas and Malamitsa, 2009; Gillis and Johnson, 2002) are among the metaphors created by participants in defining teacher concept. The opinions of Cerit (2008) as “teacher is the source and distributor of information, mother/father, friend, guide, and a person who illuminates his environment”, and Celikten (2005) as “teacher as mother-father, and teacher as gardener and doctor metaphors that are used in the education field are the ones having positive effects on students” findings are parallel to the findings of this study.

“Mother-father” metaphor is claimed in the literature to be emphasizing teachers traditional role. Clarken (1997, p.8) likens class and school to a big family. According to him, rules and values of a family should be taken into consideration at school as well. Teachers, like parents, serves both as role models and authority figure. At schools, teachers behave students having the same rights, responsibilities and authority, and improve knowledge and characters of students. Mackinnon (2004, p.401), by mentioning that using mother-father metaphor in defining teacher term is a traditional opinion, indicates that teacher, himself, makes all the decisions about the aims of teaching-learning activities, students have a passive role in making decisions about lesson and learning, and teaching and learning is the transfer of knowledge and skills from teacher to student. In this respect, elementary school students’ use of “mother-father” metaphor in defining teacher shows that students define teacher with their traditional roles, perceive school as a family, teachers have the same rights, responsibilities, and roles as their parents, and decision making authority in their teaching-learning process belong to the teacher.

It is seen that the elementary school students who participated in the study formed “angel, psychologist and friend” metaphors in “supporting personal improvement” category. This finding of the study is parallel to the finding by Cerit (2008) as “56% of the students agree with the judgement that teacher is a friend”. Besides this, studies (Aldemir and Sezer, 2009; Kasoutas and Malamitsa, 2009;

Nikitina and Furuoka, 2008; Tabak and Baumgartner, 2004; Gillis and Johnson, 2002) where “friend” metaphor is used in literature also support the findings of this study.

The metaphors which elementary school students who participated in the study used in “shaping” category to define teacher are “architect, cook, sculptor, gardener, farmer and artist”. While this finding of the study is parallel to the studies where gardener metaphor is used (Kasoutas and Malamitsa, 2009; Çelikten, 2006; Stichert, 2005; Saban, 2004; Vadeboncoeur and Torres, 2003; Gillis and Johnson, 2002; Lynn and Sensing, 2002; De Guerrero and Villamil, 2001; Porter, 1998), they do not correspond to Cerit’s (2008) study where teacher is gardener, authoritarian person, guardian, etc. finding.

In this study, it was found out that classroom level variable affects elementary school students’ perception about teacher concept. In this study which was conducted with elementary school 5th and 8th grade students, it was revealed that while metaphors formed by elementary school 5th and 8th grade students related to teacher concept are grouped mostly in “guiding, directing and protecting” category, 5th grade students have created more metaphors (67.5%) in “guiding, directing and protecting” category than 8th grade students (32.5%). This shows that 5th grade students accept the role of teacher as guiding, directing and protecting.

As a result, the findings of this study show that metaphors could be used as strong tools in revealing the perceptions of elementary school students related to the term “teacher”. Regarding the findings of the present study following suggestions can be offered: teachers could determine the expectations of the students by looking at the metaphors formed by them, and organize the environment accordingly. Results of such studies could help teachers to improve, change and inquire their perspectives related to the roles of a teacher. Additionally, studies could be conducted to reveal metaphors created by secondary school students.

References

- Aldemir, J. & Sezer, Ö. (2009). Early childhood education pre-service teachers’ images of teacher. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 10 (3), 105-122.
- Arslan, M. M. & Bayrakçı, M. (2006). Metaforik düşünme ve öğrenme yaklaşımının eğitim-öğretim açısından incelenmesi. *Milli Eğitim*, (171), 100-108.
- Ben-Peretz, M., Mendelson, N. & Kron, F. W. (2003). How teachers in different educational context view their roles. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 277-290.
- Berliner, D. C. (1990). If the Metaphor Fits, Why Not Wear It? The Teacher as Executive. *Theory into Practice*, 29(2), Metaphors We Learn By (Spring, 1990), 85-93.
- Berman, J. Boileau Little, D. Graham, L., Maurer, J. Paterson, D., Richmond, C. & Sargeant, J. (2006). A Teacher is ...: The Use of Metaphors with Pre-service Teachers”. <http://scs.une.edu.au/CF/Papers/pdf/BermanLittle.pdf>: 01.12.2006
- Cereseto, A. (2010). How are our Teachers? What teachers and others can do to improve the current situation. *The Journal of the Helen Suzman Foundation*, 56, 26-30.
- Chen, David D. (2003). A classification system for metaphors about teaching. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, February, 2003. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_go2469/is_200302/ai_n7379515: 01.12.2006.
- Clarken, R. H. (1997). *Five metaphors for educators*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March, 24-28) ED 407 408; 1-11.
- Çelikten, M. (2006). Kültür ve öğretmen metaforları. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 21(2), 269-283.
- Çelikten, M. (2005). *Eğitim sisteminde kullanılan kültür ve öğretmen metaforları*. XIV. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, 28-30 Eylül 2005, Denizli, 228-233.
- Darn, S. & White, I. (2005). Metaphorically Speaking. <http://www.eric.ed.gov/# ED493024>.
- De Guerrero, M.C & Villamil, O. S. (2001). *Metaphor analysis in second/foreign language instruction: A sociocultural perspective*. Revised version of paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, St.Louis, MO, February 24-27, ERIC database (ED461990).
- Ganser, T. (1994). *Metaphors for mentoring: an exploratory study*. Paper Prepared for Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8). (ED 370 926).
- Gillis, C. & Johnson, C. L. (2002). Metaphor as renewal: Re-imagining our professional selves. *English Journal*, July, 37-43.
- Grainger, T., Barnes, J. & Scofeham, S. (2004). Creative cocktail: Creative teaching in initial teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 30 (3), 243-253.
- Inkson, K. (2004). Images of career: Nine key metaphors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 96-111.

- James, P. (2002). Ideas in practice: Fostering metaphoring thinking. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25 (3), 26-33.
- Kadunz, G. & Sträßer, R. (2004). *Image-metaphor-diagram: Visualisation in learning mathematics*. Proceedings of the 28th Conference of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education, (4): 241–248.
- Kasoutas, M. & Malamitsa, K. (2009). Exploring Greek teachers' beliefs using metaphors. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 34 (2), 64-83.
- Keiko, S. & Gaies, S. J. (2002). Beliefs and Sakui Professional identity: a case study of a Japanese teacher of EFL writing. *The Language Teacher*, June.
- Kemp, E. (1999). Metaphor as a tool for evaluation, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 24(1), 81- 89.
- Lakoff, G. ve Johnson, M. (2005). *Metaforlar hayat, anlam ve dil*. (Çev: G. Y. Demir). İstanbul: ParadigmaYayımları.
- Mackinnon, J. (2004). Academic supervision: seeking metaphors and models for quality. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28 (4), 395-405.
- Nikitina, L. & Furuoka, F. (2008). Measuring metaphors: a factor analysis of students' conceptions of language teachers. *Metaphorik.de* 15, 161-180.
- Oğuz, A. (2005). *Öğretmen eğitim programlarında metaphor kullanma*. XIV. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, 28-30 Eylül 2005 Denizli.
- Okçabol, R. (2005). *Öğretmen yetiştirme sistemimiz*. Ankara: ÜtopyaYayınevi.
- Parvaresh, V. (2008). Metaphorical conceptualizations of an adult EFL learner: where old concepts are impregnable. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 2 (2), 154-161.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002) Teaching and training with metaphor. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23(1), 93–99.
- Perry, C. & Cooper, M. (2001). Metaphors are good mirrors: Reflectiong on change for teacher educators. *Reflective Practice*. 2 (1), 41-52.
- Porter, M. (1998). Points of light, bridges to the future, flower gardens, and the alamo: Rural teachers' metaphors of schooling. *The Teacher Educator*, 33, 185-208.
- Saban, A. (2004). Prospective classroom teachers' metaphorical images of selves and comparing them to those they have of their elementary and cooperating teachers. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 24, 617-635.
- Saban, A. (2004). Giriş düzeyindeki sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmen kavramına ilişkin ileri sürdükleri metaforlar. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2 (2), 131-155.
- Saban, A. Koçbeker, B. N. & Saban, A. (2006). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen kavramına ilişkin algılarının metaphor analizi yoluyla incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 6 (2), 461-522.
- Saban, A. Koçbeker, B. N. & Saban, A. (2007). Prospective teachers' conceptions of teaching and learning revealed through metaphor analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 17, 123-139.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2004). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim: Kuram ve uygulamaya*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Snow, R.E. (1973). *Theory construction for research on teaching*. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.), *Handbook of re- search on teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 77-133). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Stichert, E. G. (2005). *Preservice science teachers perception of profession with metaphorical images and reasons of choosing teaching as a profession*. A thesis submitted to The Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences of Middle East Technical University.
- Sumsion, J. (2002). Becoming, being and unbecoming an early childhood educator: A phenomenological case study of teacher attrition. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 869–885.
- Wright, V., Sundberg, C., Yarbrough, S., Wilson, E., & Stallworth, B. (2002). Construction of teaching metaphors through the use of technology, *Electronic Journal for the Integration of Technology in Education*, 2 (1), 2-22.<http://ejite.isu.edu/volume2no1/wright.pdf>:01.04.2010.
- Yung, B. H. W. (2001). Examiner, policeman or students' companion: Teachers perceptions of their role in an assesment reform. *Educational Review*. 53(3), 251-260.
- Zhou, D. & Heineken, E. (2008). Encounter foreign metaphors: a cross-cultural online study. *Sprache, Kultur und Zielgruppen*, 217-241.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı ilköğretim öğrencilerinin “öğretmen” kavramına ilişkin kullandıkları metaforlar aracılığıyla öğretmenlerin sahip olduğu kişisel ve mesleki özelliklerin ortaya çıkarılmasıdır. Tarama modeli benimsenerek gerçekleştirilen araştırmanın katılımcılarını 2009-2010 öğretim yılı bahar döneminde Eskişehir İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü’ne bağlı ilköğretim okullarında öğrenim gören 5. ve 8. sınıf öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada küme örnekleme yöntemlerinden oranlı küme örnekleme yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, çalışmanın örneklemini Eskişehir Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü’ne bağlı ilköğretim okullarından sosyoekonomik düzeyine göre üst, orta ve alt sosyo-ekonomik olmak üzere üçer ilköğretim okulu belirlenmiştir. Belirlenen bu okullardan beşinci ve sekizinci sınıflar seçilmiş, araştırma, seçilen bu sınıflar üzerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmaya 5. sınıftan 320, 8. sınıftan ise 247 olmak üzere toplam 567 öğrenci katılmıştır. Bu öğrencilerin 297’si kız, 270’i ise erkek öğrencidir.

Araştırma verileri ilköğretim 5. ve 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin “öğretmen” kavramına ilişkin kullandıkları metaforları belirlemeye yönelik olarak geliştirilen nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden yarı yapılandırılmış açık uçlu anket formu kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan ilköğretim öğrencilerinin “öğretmen” kavramına ilişkin sahip oldukları algıları belirlemek amacıyla onların her birinden “Öğretmen.....gibidir. Çünkü:” cümlesini tamamlamaları istenmiştir. Araştırmada, ilköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretmen kavramına yönelik düşüncelerini belirleyebilmek amacıyla oluşturdukları metaforların analizinde “içerik analizi” tekniği kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın amacına uygun olarak nitel yöntemle analiz edilen veriler, nicel yöntem kullanılarak SPSS ortamına aktarılmıştır. Araştırma verilerinin analizi ve yorumlanmasında nitel ve nicel veri analizlerinden yararlanılmıştır. 429 öğrencinin oluşturduğu metaforlar bu araştırma için değerlendirmeye alınmıştır. Öğrencilerin oluşturdukları metaforların analiz edilmesi ve yorumlanması süreci “adlandırma”, “tasnif etme (eleme ve arıtma)”, “yeniden organize etme ve derleme”, “kategori geliştirme” ve “nicel veri analizi için verilerin SPSS paket programına aktarılması” aşamaları göz izlenerek gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Adlandırma aşamasında her öğrenci tarafından geliştirilmiş olan metaforlar kodlanmıştır. Bu aşamada, öğrenciler tarafından herhangi bir şey yazılmayan ve herhangi bir metaforun tanınmadığı kâğıtlar elenmiştir. Tasnif etme aşamasında metafor analizi ve içerik analizi teknikleri kullanılarak, öğrenciler tarafından geliştirilen metaforlar tek tek okunup gözden geçirilmiş, diğer metaforlarla benzerlikleri ve ortak özellikleri bakımından analiz edilmiştir. Yeniden organize etme ve derleme aşamasında metaforlar organize edilmiş ve bu aşamada 83 adet geçerli metafor elde edilmiştir. Böylece bir metafor listesi oluşturulmuştur. Kategori geliştirme aşamasında ise öğrencilerin açık uçlu ankette belirttikleri metafor ifadelerinden yola çıkılarak, metaforlar ortak özellikleri bakımından altı kavramsal kategori altında toplanmıştır. Bu aşamalar tamamlandıktan sonra araştırmanın güvenilirliğini gerçekleştirmek amacıyla, öğrencilerin oluşturmuş oldukları metaforlar, araştırmacılar dışında alandan başka bir uzman tarafından da belirlenmiştir. Elde edilen metaforlar, “Görüş Birliği” ve “Görüş Ayrılığı” olarak ortaya konulmuştur. Araştırmanın güvenilirliği için Miles ve Huberman’ın (1994) belirttiği, P (Uzlaşma Yüzdesi) = $\left[\frac{Na}{Na + Nd} \right] \times 100$ formül kullanılmış ve hesaplama sonucunda $P = 93.10$ değeri bulunarak araştırma güvenilir kabul edilmiştir. Nicel veri analizi için veriler SPSS programına aktarılmıştır. Oluşturulan altı adet kavramsal kategorinin verileri sayısallaştırılmış ve her bir metaforu ve kategoriye temsil eden öğrenci sayısı (f) ve yüzdesi (%) hesaplanmıştır. Daha sonra, ortaya çıkan kategorilerin öğrencilerin cinsiyeti, sınıf düzeyi ve okul düzeyine göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini sınamak için “Pearson chi-square testi” uygulanmıştır.

Araştırma sonucunda ilköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretmen kavramına ilişkin oluşturdukları metaforların “yol gösterici, yönlendirici ve koruyucu” ve “bilgi sağlayıcı” kategorileri altında daha fazla yoğunlaştığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan ilköğretim öğrencilerinin “bilgi sağlayıcı” kategorisi altında “çiçek, kitap, ağaç, bilgisayar, bilgi makinesi, doktor, vb.” metaforlar oluşturdukları ortaya çıkmıştır. İlköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretmenlerini çiçek metaforu ile tanımlamaları bir bakıma kendilerini de birer arı gibi algıladıklarını göstermektedir. Arının ihtiyacı olan bal özü ve nektarını çiçeklere konarak aldığı gibi; öğrenci de bilgisini öğretmeninden almaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra öğrencilerin öğretmeni tanımlarken ağaç metaforunu kullanmaları, kendilerini de ağaçların meyvesi biçiminde algıladıklarını göstermektedir. Öğretmeni su metaforunu kullanarak açıklayan öğrencilerin ise öğretmeni yaşamın devamlılığını sağlaması için insanlığı besleyip geliştiren, bilgilerle yaşam kaynağı sunan en güçlü kaynak olarak gördükleri söylenebilir. “Doktor” metaforu kullanılarak öğretmen kavramının açıklanması, öğretmenin hastalıkları iyileştirme ve hataları düzeltme rolünü yansıtmaktadır. Clarken’e göre (1997, s.10) öğretmenler öğrencilerinin zihinsel yetersizliklerini nasıl iyileştireceğini bilmeli ve buna uygun olarak öğrencilerine öğretim etkinliği sunmalıdır.

Araştırmaya katılan ilköğretim öğrencilerinin büyük çoğunluğunun öğretmeni “Yol gösterici, yönlendirici ve koruyucu” olarak algıladığı ortaya çıkmıştır. İlköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretmen kavramını açıklarken “yol gösterici, yönlendirici ve koruyucu” kategorisi altında en fazla “anne-baba, karınca, ateş böceği, güneş, fener, meşale ve lamba” metaforunu kullandığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. İlgili alanyazında da öğretmen kavramına ilişkin en yoğun biçimde oluşturulan metaforların “anne-baba” olduğuna ilişkin çalışmalar bulunmaktadır (Saban, 2004; Ganser, 1994). Alanyazında öğretmen kavramının açıklanmasında “anne-baba” metaforunun kullanılmasının, öğretmenin geleneksel rollerine vurgu yapıldığı belirtilmektedir. Clarken, (1997, s.8) sınıfı ve okulu geniş bir aileye benzetmektedir. Ona göre ailenin kuralları ve değerleri okullarda göz önünde bulundurulmaktadır. Öğretmenler de ebeveynler gibi hem rol modeli hem de otorite figürü olarak hizmet ederler. Öğretmenler okullarda öğrencilere ebeveynlerin sahip oldukları hak, sorumluluk ve yetkilere aynen sahip olarak davranır, çocukların bilgi ve karakterlerini geliştirirler. Mackinnon (2004, s.401) da, öğretmen kavramını açıklamada anne-baba metaforunun kullanımının geleneksel bir görüş olduğuna değinerek, öğretmenin öğretme-öğrenme etkinliklerinin amaçları hakkında tüm kararları kendisinin verdiğini, öğrencinin ders ve öğrenme ile ilgili her konuda karar vermede pasif bir konumda olduğunu, öğretme ve öğrenmenin öğretmenden öğrenciye bilgi ve beceri aktarımı olduğunu belirtmektedir.

Araştırmaya katılan ilköğretim öğrencilerinin “bireysel gelişimi destekleyici” kategorisi altında genellikle “melek, psikolog ve arkadaş” metaforlarını kullandıkları ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunun yanı sıra bu araştırmada ilköğretim öğrencilerinin “biçimlendirici” kategorisi altında öğretmen kavramını açıklarken kullandıkları metaforların “mimar, aşçı, heykeltıraş, bahçıvan, çiftçi ve sanatçı” olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bahçıvan metaforu, öğretmenin aktif bilgi dağıtıcı, öğrencinin ise pasif bilgi alıcı olduğu bir öğretme öğrenme sürecini yansıtmaktadır (Aldemir ve Sezer, 2009, s.117). Saban (2004) öğretmen kavramını açıklamada “bahçıvan” metaforunun kullanılmasının, öğretmenin sevgi dolu bir öğrenme ortamında öğrencinin bireysel yeteneğinin beslenmesi rolüne dikkat çekmektedir. Bu araştırmada ilköğretim öğrencilerinin sınıf düzeyi değişkenlerinin, onların öğretmen kavramına ilişkin algılarını önemli ölçüde etkilediği ortaya çıkmıştır. İlköğretim 5.ve 8. sınıf öğrencileri üzerinde gerçekleştirilen bu araştırmada her iki sınıf düzeyinde de öğrenciler tarafından öğretmen kavramına ilişkin oluşturulan metaforlar “yol gösterici, yönlendirici ve koruyucu” kategorisi altında daha yoğun bir biçimde toplanırken, 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin “yol gösterici-yönlendirici ve koruyucu” kategorisi altında (%67.5) 8.sınıf öğrencilerine oranla (%32.5) daha fazla metafor ürettikleri, öğretmeni yol gösteren, yönlendiren ve koruyan rollerini daha fazla benimsedikleri ortaya çıkmıştır.

Sonuç olarak, bu araştırmanın bulguları metaforların ilköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretmen kavramına ilişkin sahip oldukları algıları ortaya çıkarmada güçlü birer araç olarak kullanılabileceğini göstermektedir. Gerçekleştirilen bu araştırma sonucunda aşağıdaki önerileri getirmek olanaklıdır:

- Öğretmenler, öğrenciler tarafından oluşturulan metaforlara dayalı olarak öğrencilerin kendilerinden beklentilerini belirleyebilir, bu beklentileri karşılamak amacıyla uygun ortamlar düzenleyebilirler.
- İlköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretmen kavramını açıklamada kullandıkları metaforlara bakılarak öğretmenin eğitim sistemindeki rolleri ve sorumlulukları daha iyi anlaşılabilir.
- Araştırma sonuçlarına dayalı olarak öğretmenlerin rollerine ilişkin perspektiflerini geliştirme, değiştirme ve uygulamalarına yönelik hizmetiçi eğitim etkinlikleri düzenlenebilir.
- Öğretmenlerin, öğretmen kavramına yükledikleri metaforlara ilişkin çalışmalar yapılabilir.
- İlköğretim öğrencilerinin ideallerindeki öğretmene ilişkin metafor üretmeleri sağlanabilir.
- Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrenci kavramına yükledikleri metaforlara ilişkin çalışmalar yapılabilir.
- Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrenci kavramına yükledikleri metaforlar ile ilköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretmen kavramına yükledikleri metaforlar karşılaştırmalı bir araştırmada ele alınabilir.