

## A METAPHOR ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH TEACHER CANDIDATES' PRE- AND POST-COURSE BELIEFS ABOUT LANGUAGE AND TEACHING

### İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Dil ve Öğretime İlişkin Ders Öncesi ve Sonrası İnançlarının Metafor Analizi

Meliha R. ŞİMŞEK<sup>1</sup>

#### Abstract

*Students can't escape the influence of metaphorical language used in their coursebooks and by their teachers, trainers and mentors. Metaphor scaffolds their understanding of key concepts and develops awareness through reflection. As their choice of certain methods depends on their tacit theories of language and teaching, metaphor analysis also serves to uncover their professional beliefs and to assess their knowledge growth. Therefore, 70 language and 68 teacher metaphors of 37 sophomores (FLE Department, METU) were analyzed by using Cameron and Low's methodology (1999) and within the framework of Oxford et al. (1998) and Richards and Rodgers (2002) in order to investigate their beliefs before and after taking the course, "Approaches to ELT". While 70% adopted functional and interactional views of language and 54% a learner-centered view of teaching, the behaviourist view of teaching was maintained by 46% and a participatory view of teaching was supported by none.*

**Keywords:** metaphor analysis, awareness, reflection

#### Özet

*Öğrenciler ders kitaplarındaki ve öğretmenleri, eğitmenleri ve yönderleri tarafından kullanılan değişmeceli dilin etkisinden kaçamazlar. Metafor önemli kavramları anlamalarını kolaylaştırır ve yansıma yoluyla farkındalık geliştirir. Belirli yöntemleri seçimleri, dil ile öğretime ilişkin örtük kuramlarına dayandığı için metafor analizi mesleki inançlarını ortaya çıkarmaya ve bilgi gelişimlerini değerlendirmeye yarar. Bu nedenle, 37 ikinci-sınıf öğrencisine ait 70 dil ve 68 öğretmen metaforu (YDEB, ODTÜ) Cameron ve Low'un (1999) yöntemi kullanılarak ve Oxford vd. (1998) ile Richards ve Rodgers'ın (2002) çerçevesinde "İngilizce Öğretiminde Yaklaşımlar" dersini almadan önceki ve aldıktan sonraki inançlarını araştırmak için çözümlenmiştir. %70'i işlevsel ve etkileşimsel dil görüşünü ve %54'ü öğrenci-odaklı öğretim görüşünü benimserken, davranışçı öğretim görüşü %46'sı tarafından korunmuş ve katılımcı öğretim görüşü hiçbiri tarafından desteklenmemiştir.*

**Anahtar sözcükler:** metafor analizi, farkındalık, yansıma

<sup>1</sup> Yrd.Doç.Dr.; Mersin Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, Mersin, malliday@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

Metaphor is defined as “a comparison between two dissimilar notions where one notion is to be understood in terms of the other notion” as in: “All the world’s a stage, and all the men and women merely players” (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2009: 313; Shakespeare, 2007: 622). For most people, metaphor is “a device of the poetic imagination”, “a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language” and typically viewed as “a matter of words rather than thought or action” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003: 3). According to Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 4-5, 7), “our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” and the pervasiveness of metaphor in everyday life is substantiated by linguistic evidence: the vocabulary in the “ARGUMENT IS WAR” metaphor (“attack a position, indefensible, strategy, new line of attack, win, gain ground” etc.) indicate “a systematic way of talking about the battling aspects of arguing” and “structures the actions we perform in arguing”. In short, there is more to metaphor than a figure of speech, a deviant form of language use usually found in literature. It is “a problem-solving device applicable to all fields, including language learning and teaching” (Oxford et al., 1998: 4). The benefits of metaphor are two-fold: it raises learners’ awareness of key concepts and enables teachers to reflect on their experience and develop professionally (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999).

Studies documented teachers’ tendency to use metaphors “when talking about their profession, their beliefs and their daily practices” (Guerrero & Villamil, 2002: 97). Herron (1982: 235) went so far as to claim “what we teach” and “how we teach it” are closely linked to a metaphor and emphasized the need for understanding it to comprehend our actions. Martinez et al. (2001) recognized their inherent potential to influence teachers’ educational practice: a teacher preferring the captain metaphor is more inclined to practise strict control over students than that preferring the entertainer metaphor.

Despite the prevalent use of metaphorical language and recognition of metaphorical analysis in language teaching, “few empirical studies have been conducted” (Guerrero & Villamil, 2002: 98). Among the leading studies cited by Guerrero and Villamil (2002), it is only in Cortazzi and Jin (1999) that language and teaching metaphors were researched. The use of metaphors focusing on “both teaching and language” has been advocated in the field of language teacher training “in order to raise trainees’ awareness of language learning processes” (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999: 156). It is considered that the dual presentation of language and teacher metaphors within a theoretical framework will reveal their personal theories of language and teaching, and may have important implications for those giving and taking an introductory course like “Approaches to ELT”. For this reason, the purpose of this study is to investigate student teachers’ basic conceptualizations of language and teaching by examining their metaphors and to describe the change between their pre-

and post-course beliefs reflected in their restructurings. The following research questions are addressed in the present study: i. What kind of language and teaching metaphors do English teacher candidates have before taking the introductory course, *Approaches to ELT?*; ii. What kind of language and teaching metaphors do English teacher candidates generate after taking the introductory course, *Approaches to ELT?*; iii. Do their language and teaching metaphors change over the semester?; and iv. What are the underlying theories of English teacher candidates entailed in their language and teaching metaphors?

### **Related Research**

A review of over thirty studies shows that metaphor analysis has been undertaken for exploring participants' beliefs about varied concepts like the teacher, principal, school, student, technology, social network and textbooks (Cerit, 2008a; Cerit, 2008b; Gök & Erdoğan, 2010; Gurol & Donmus, 2010; Kesen, 2010; Saban, 2010; Saban, 2011). The most widely studied is but the concept of the teacher: about 4000 participants produced nearly 1500 metaphors, divided into eight (Wan et al., 2011) to 17 themes (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999). These articles included small case studies of three participants (Farrell, 2006) as well as large scale studies with 17 (Hongqin & Jianbin, 2008) to 1142 participants (Saban et al., 2007). Although participants varied in gender, experience, geography, context and content, "many teacher metaphors are conventional, ... stable, systematic expressions used pervasively within our culture" (Alger, 2009: 744).

However, the thematic similarity between conceptual categories of different studies is apparent. For instance, Guerrero and Villamil (2002) analyzed 28 metaphors of 22 ESL teachers and obtained nine categories in Puerto Rico: teacher as cooperative leader, provider of knowledge, agent of change, nurturer, provider of knowledge, innovator, provider of tools, artist, repairer, gym instructor. Wan et al. (2011) explored the belief mismatches between 70 students and 33 EFL teachers, and generated eight categories in China: teacher as provider, nurturer, devotee, instructor, culture transmitter, authority, interest arouser, co-worker. The context switched from the second language to foreign language but there are shared categories between the two studies at a distance of almost ten years.

Similarly, Ocak and Gündüz (2006) elicited 620 metaphors from 362 student teachers, majoring in Elementary, Social Science and Early Childhood Education, and acquired eleven categories: teacher as guide, sacrificer, illuminator, authority, source of knowledge, carrier, integrator, role model, molder, innovator, agent of development. Saban et al. (2006) conducted another study with 1222 teacher candidates, studying at Classroom Teaching, English Education and Instructional Technologies, and grouped 111 metaphors into 10 categories: teacher as knowledge provider, molder, curer, superior authority figure, change agent, entertainer, archetype of spirit, nurturer,

facilitator, cooperative leader. Although distributional differences were found across gender and program types, the synonymity between the categories of these concurrent studies cannot go unnoticed.

Yet, “a shared system of interpretation and classification” is needed for communicating and elaborating metaphors cooperatively (Martinez et al., 2001: 967). Consequently, Oxford et al.’s (1998: 3) taxonomy was chosen as the framework for this study, as it is based on a variety of metaphors describing language teachers especially and shows “how language teaching methods relate to these metaphors”.

### **Framework For This Study**

Oxford et al. (1998) identified four educational perspectives: Social Order, Cultural Transmission, Learner-Centered Growth, and Social Reform. The Social Order perspective designates “the school as a factory”, where the teacher is responsible for “molding learners for the needs of society” (Oxford et al., 1998: 8, 13). The exemplar metaphors are the teacher as “manufacturer, competitor, hanging judge, doctor, mind-and-behavior controller” (Oxford et al., 1998: 14). Since there is strict control over students and the outcome is to obtain “a standardized product”, it is instantiated by Audiolingualism and Suggestopedia (Oxford et al., 1998: 24).

The Cultural Transmission perspective is concerned with “initiation into the historical practices and achievements of a given society” (Oxford et al., 1998: 8). The teacher is “overtly revered...for having access to knowledge and for being correct all the time” (Oxford et al., 1998: 24). The exemplar metaphors, “Teacher as Conduit and Repeater”, embody a unidirectional flow of information from the expert to the empty container (Oxford et al., 1998: 24). The Grammar-Translation Method can be associated with it, for memorization, repetition and translation are involved (Oxford et al., 1998).

From the Learner-Centered Growth viewpoint, the teacher must foster the right conditions for learners to develop their innate potentialities (Oxford et al., 1998). The roles of the teacher as “nurturer, lover or spouse, scaffolder, entertainer and delegator” focus on the individual learner and require “devoted sharing and facilitation” (Oxford et al., 1998: 40). Community Language Learning, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Silent Way can be considered here.

According to the Social Reform perspective, learners should engage in joint social problem-solving and develop intellectual and social skills for future life, while the teacher as “acceptor” and “learning partner” “invites, encourages and accepts many different ideas” and “actively fosters democratic participation” (Oxford et al., 1998: 41). “Any form of language learning in which students are encouraged to engage in a community of learners” is compatible with the Social Reform perspective (Oxford et al., 1998: 44).

With the purpose of evaluating language metaphors, Richards and Rodgers’ (2002) triad of language views is used. Current approaches and methods in language teaching are informed by three views of language: the

structural, functional and interactional view (Richards & Rodgers, 2002). The structural view conceives language as “a system of structurally related elements for the coding of meaning” and aims at “the mastery of elements of this system” (Richards & Rodgers, 2002: 20-21). The functional view holds that “language is a vehicle for the expression of functional meaning” and emphasizes categories of meaning and function (Richards & Rodgers, 2002: 21). The interactional view regards language as “a vehicle... for the performance of social transactions” and organizes the teaching content by interactional patterns or around learner inclinations (Richards & Rodgers, 2002: 21). Audiolingualism, CLT and Task-Based Instruction spring from these three models of language (Richards & Rodgers, 2002).

## **METHOD**

### **Participants**

The participants were 10 male and 27 female sophomores (n=37), aged 19-21, at the Department of Foreign Language Education (Middle East Technical University). Since the researcher was also the instructor of the course, “Approaches to ELT”, convenience sampling was used in the study in order to gain insight into the participants’ pre- and post-course beliefs about language and EFL teaching. Convenience cases “represent sites or individuals from which the researcher can access and easily collect data” and is “probably the most common sampling strategy” in qualitative research, where the purpose is not to make generalizations but to shed light upon the specific (Creswell, 2007: 126; Patton, 2002: 242). To ensure the anonymity of their data, each student was assigned a case number (e.g. S1) (Ciambone, 2004).

### **Data Collection**

The initial metaphor elicitation took place at the beginning of the course in the fall semester of the 2011-2012 academic year. The departmental goal of the course is: i. to familiarize the students with the history of language teaching, ii. to develop an understanding of approaches, methods and techniques in ELT with respect to their underlying theories and principle, iii. to raise awareness about the connection ELT has with theories of psychology and linguistics, and iv. to assist the students to develop a critical understanding of ELT methodology and eclecticism in ELT (Undergraduate Program Course Descriptions). Since the course introduced English teacher candidates into theories of language and language learning, it has a formative influence on their beliefs about what language is and how it is taught. In order to familiarize the participants with the concept of metaphor, they were first given the definition and an example of a metaphor. Since they were already taught the terms in the English Literature class, they easily identified the similes in the first stanzas of an English and Turkish poem and told to write their own metaphors of language and teaching by completing these prompts within 60 minutes: “Language/An EFL teacher is like... because...”. During the course,

they followed the coursebooks, “Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching” (Richards and Rodgers, 2002) and “Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching” (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011), watched videos of language teaching methods (Larsen-Freeman, 1990), participated in class discussions and gave demonstration lessons, so that they could devise their own theories of language and teaching by building upon their theoretical and practical knowledge. After 10 weeks, metaphor elicitation was repeated for reformulations.

### **Data Analysis**

The qualitative data were analyzed by using Cameron and Low’s (1999) methodology of metaphor analysis. These four steps were followed: i. linguistic metaphors were listed as similes; ii. they were broken down into analysable parts to determine salient features and similarities; iii. exemplar metaphors were assigned to a conceptual category they represented, and iv. entailments were examined “to identify the participants’ assumptions or theories underlying the metaphors” (Guerrero & Villamil, 2002: 101).

Yıldırım and Şimşek (2011) recommended the use of a theoretical framework for establishing the thematic categories beforehand. As a result, a total of 70 language metaphors were grouped into three and 68 teacher metaphors into four categories by using Oxford et al.’s (1998) with Richards and Rodgers’ (2002) typologies. To ensure validity, the participants were invited to confirm the researcher’s findings and the tentative results were refined in the light of their reactions (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Silverman & Marvasti, 2008). In addition to comprehensive data treatment, thick description was used: the raw data were faithfully presented to the reader in its originality by keeping the students’ language intact (Silverman & Marvasti, 2008; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011).

To ensure reliability, intercoder agreement checks were conducted: a list of metaphors with another list of definitive descriptions were administered to two experts. The intercoder reliability was calculated with Miles and Huberman’s (1994) formula:  $\text{reliability} = \frac{\text{agreement}}{\text{agreement} + \text{disagreement}}$ . Now that there must be at least 90% agreement between the coders, the desired level of reliability (0.97) was achieved (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The first coder placed the magic mug metaphor under the Learner-Centered Growth and the cartoonist metaphor under the Cultural Transmission category, while the second coder placed the wind and captain metaphors under the Learner-Centered Growth category. In the coding of language metaphors, the first coder placed the local food metaphor under the interactional and the plane metaphor under the structural type, while the second coder placed the planet metaphor under the structural and the painting metaphor under the interactional type. Ultimately, frequencies and percentages were calculated by using Excel, and appropriate tabulations were used because the quantification of qualitative data can increase reliability, decrease bias and enable comparison between categories (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011).

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents the distribution of students' initial language metaphors. It is found that structural metaphors (39%) outnumber functional (30.5%) and interactional metaphors (30.5%), and 38% view language as a complex, intricate, rule-based system formed out of smaller units, as in the "hand-woven carpet" in Table 2. In the functional category, language is described by 30% as a versatile vehicle for getting things done as in the feet example, whereas 32% consider it as a communication instrument for exchanging cultural information and developing social relations as in the "meal table".

**Tablo 1.** *Initial Language Metaphors*

Type	Student		Metaphor		Exemplars
	f	%	f	%	
Structural	14	38	14	39	knitting, musical harmony, book, girlfriend, hand-woven carpet, computer, jewellery box, aeroplane, tree, local food, audio CD, galaxy, water, tangled ball of rope
Functional	11	30	11	30.5	feet, electricity, planets, piano, painting, hands, cigarettes, river, train, computer, tennis
Interactional	12	32	11	30.5	highway, bridge, meal table, cuisine, key ring, glass, humanbeing, jungle, counsellor, clothes, key
Total	37	100	36	100	

**Tablo 2.** *Examples of Initial Language Metaphors*

Type <sup>a</sup>	Initial Language Metaphors
S	Language is like a hand-woven carpet composed of little parts = letters, morphemes, syllables and words. Although some features change at times, it has a specific shape (certain rules). Both have their own patterns belonging to their region. People who weave carpets create some differences but patterns stay the same. Languages also have their own core features.
F	Language is like your feet because it carries you wherever you want. Thanks to your feet, you can enter everywhere and realize your needs. Thanks to language, you express yourself and go wherever you want in meaning. You can't give up your feet and so your language. It expresses your needs.
I	Language is like a meal table that conveys plates, glasses and foods. Language conveys our knowledge, thoughts, feelings. It exchanges culture. Table is a via. With language, we can communicate with other people and learn about their characteristics and culture. Like shapes and materials of tables, languages and their systems may be different. But, they play same role on communication.

<sup>a</sup>S: structural; F: functional; I: interactional

It can be observed from Table 3 that functional metaphors (44%) becomes the dominant category, whereas structural metaphors are reduced from 39% to 27% at the end of the term. There is a mild decrease in interactional metaphors (29%), too. It is worth noting that 70% of them have shown a stronger tendency for functional and interactional metaphors like the converter and password examples in Table 4. Yet, 30% still have traditional conceptions of language as in the “rubik’s cube”. This increase in the supporters of functional metaphors can be related to the popularity of the mainstream method, CLT, among students.

**Table 3.** *Final Language Metaphors*

Type	Student		Metaphor		Exemplars
	f	%	f	%	
Structural	11	30	9	27	jigsaw puzzle, tree, architectural building, galaxy, humanbeing, rubik’s cube, cuisine, skeleton, toothpaste
Functional	15	40	15	44	lamp, movie, chocolate, glass, pencil, eyeglasses, war, car, spikes, musical instrument, converter, road, painting, plane, jar of jam
Interactional	11	30	10	29	water, flower, fire, heart, social laws, the sun, passport, password, picklock, eyes
Total	37	100	34	100	

**Table 4.** *Examples of Final Language Metaphors*

Type <sup>a</sup>	Final Language Metaphors
S	Language is like a rubic cube because it has a different harmony. When you can make all surfaces just one color, it looks tidier. There are lots of languages with different phonemes, morphemes, syntax. The colors on rubic cube are like different languages. When you solve one color, others not always solved. It is because of languages’ different structures. When we understand their structure, we can build meaningful sentences.
F	Language is like a converter. It transforms data into another meaningful scale. Language converts our thoughts into speech and enables us to meet our needs. Thanks to language, we know what others think, what’s going on. We maintain even our daily basic rituals by language. Without language, we wouldn’t be able to survive because communication is the base for all our activities.



- I Language is like a password. If you know it, you have no boundaries, it lets you go through all doors. Imagine you are in a building with the doors locked. With the password, you can reach every room. To reach out a country and its citizens, you need to know their language. Without it, you can't reach and communicate people which is at the bottom of building a society. As humanbeings, we need to be in a society. Society uses language as password.

<sup>a</sup>S: structural; F: functional; I: interactional

Cortazzi and Jin (1999: 164-165) collected 412 metaphors from 140 first- and second-year undergraduates of Linguistics and classified them into 12 generic types: Language is “nature, leisure, a tool or object, everyday life, (part of) a building or building materials, society, relationships or people, clothes, cloth or jewellery, a journey, an institution, a biological activity, body parts, finance”. Although they clearly understood the communicative role of language, structural and functional themes dominated in Cortazzi and Jin (1999), unlike the current study, where final metaphors indicate predominantly functional and interactional views of language.

The task difficulty and lack of background accounted for the first-year students' inclination towards structural metaphors, while second-year students gave more functional examples (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999). The difference between the metaphors of first- and second-year students reflects learning over several semesters (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999). As a result, the present study repeated metaphor elicitation to explore their restructurings in time.

The classification results of students' initial teacher metaphors on the basis of Oxford et al.'s (1998) typology are tabulated below.

**Table 5. Initial Teacher Metaphors**

Type	Student		Metaphor		Exemplars
	f	%	f	%	
Social Order	9	24	7	24	tamer, potter, software developer, sculptor, horseman, glassmaker, engineer
Cultural Transmission	13	35	10	35	heart, locomotive, book, architect, football manager, pack leader, magic mug, computer case, wind, author
Learner-Centered Growth	15	41	12	41	parent, sun, team coach, water, trail guide, navigator, cow, burning candle, gatekeeper, ship captain, camp leader, river
Social Reform	0	0	0	0	-
Total	37	100	29	100	

**Table 6.** *Examples of Initial Teacher Metaphors*

Type <sup>b</sup>	Initial Teacher Metaphors
O	An EFL teacher is like sculptor who produces unique masterpiece by giving all his care and experiences to raw materials. Materials takes a new shape in his hand. Because student doesn't know anything about new language, he needs to be shaped by a instructor. Thanks to teacher, student gains a new language.
T	An EFL teacher is like a computer case. Monitor, mouse and keyboard are students. They are bound to the case. If the teacher doesn't exist, students can't product anything. The teacher is full of information. She gives order, controls others and transmits information via some invisible wires. She knows how monitor works and what to do in order to make it active.
G	An EFL teacher is like a trail guide to light students' ways out of English. Students do tasks and teacher should be the helping hand when needed. If teacher is the center, doing and showing all, than students get used to ready-to-learn classes. They get lost when there is noone to copy information. They must handle problems alone. So, a teacher is a trail guide handing a light but not driving students to the target.
R	-

<sup>b</sup>O: social order; T: cultural transmission; G: learner-centred growth; R: social reform

According to Table 5, 24% of initial teacher metaphors belong to the Social Order, 35% to the Cultural Transmission, and 41% to the Learner-Centered Growth, whereas no metaphors are generated in the Social Reform perspective. It is evident from Table 5 that more than half of them (59%) adopt classic images of "a sculptor" and "a computer case" as in Table 6, which portray the teacher as an all-knowing expert, either shaping inexperienced students into socially desirable individuals or delivering knowledge to uninformed learners. The rest (41%) indicate an initial preference for more independent metaphors like the trail guide, where the teacher never intervenes but merely facilitates learning by providing care and organizing lessons around learner interests.

Nikitina and Furuoka (2008) undertook a similar study in the Asian context, where 23 sophomores produced 27 metaphors, and the majority reflected the Learner-Centered Growth (66.7%), followed by the Cultural Transmission (22.2%) and the Social Order (11.1%). Their results stand in

direct contrast to the present study, for the Turkish sophomores initially have more teacher-centered metaphors. However, in both studies, no metaphors are found in the Social Reform perspective, which “could be culturally-determined”, as their previous learning experiences might not have prepared them for a democratic type of classroom interaction, but accustomed them to “a hierarchical organization where the teachers are to be respected” “than befriended or be treated as equals” (Nikitina & Furuoka, 2008: 202). The mother, candle, parent, water, animal metaphors are shared in the Learner-Centered Growth category and may point to a commonality with respect to the notion of teacher as a caregiver or nurturer across different contexts (Nikitina & Furuoka, 2008; Oxford et al., 1998; White & Smith, 1994).

This prevalence of the parent metaphor was evidenced by cross-cultural research before. In Cortazzi and Jin’s (1999: 175) analysis of Chinese, Turkish, Japanese, Lebanese and Iranian metaphors, the friend and parent metaphors dominated, whereas the British data had 13 instances of “parent” and none of “friend”, which “may be a clear signal of different cultural frames”. Other shared metaphors with their Turkish group include the teacher as a source of knowledge, a guide and a sunny day: cf. the teacher as: i. “a book that presents everything and shows the things to be done” (S8), ii. “a navigator that helps students reach their destinations and shows different ways” (S19) and iii. “the sun that provides necessary lights for plants” (S2).

In a more recent cross-cultural study, conducted with 154 Turkish and 37 Polish teacher candidates, Can et al. (2011) revealed some metaphors like the guide were found across contexts. However, there were other metaphors like the teacher as an artist/craftsman, which appeared only in the Turkish students’ pre-training questionnaire but never in the Polish responses (Can et al., 2011). Likewise, the Turkish participants of the current research have provided the potter, sculptor, glassmaker metaphors, which implicate artisanship in relation to the teaching profession. Although the metaphor recognizes the uniqueness of learners and “implies a conceptualization of teaching as a creative endeavour”, it is “highly conventional”: “the learner merely supplies the raw material” and “the learning process entailed is an entirely passive one” (Guerrero & Villamil, 2002: 112).

The captain, leader, parent/caregiver, guide, coordinator, candle metaphors in Can et al. (2011) are also available in the present study, only with different wordings: i.e. the ship captain, camp leader, trail guide, football manager, burning candle. Having been identified by Hongqin and Jianbin (2008: 5) as “a widely known metaphor for teachers” in the Chinese society, the portrayal of the teacher as “a burning candle, which shares its own light with other new ones and illuminates new horizons, despite winds” (S29) deserves special interest because it refers to the tediousness of their work, which “may result in teacher fatigue and burn-out”.

Table 7 displays the distribution of students’ final teacher metaphors with respect to Oxford et al.’s (1998) taxonomy.

**Table 7.** Final Teacher Metaphors

Type	Student		Metaphor		Exemplars
	f	%	f	%	
Social Order	11	30	9	31	cook, fitness trainer, composer, shepherd, carpenter, chicken farmer, animal tamer with a whip, pen, dog trainer
Cultural Transmission	6	16	6	21	singer, theatre player, contest announcer, captain, driver, brain
Learner-Centered Growth	20	54	14	48	navigator, coach, film director, tree, master of an orchestra, masterchef, parent, babysitter, headworker, doctor, guide, traffic police, commander, cartoonist
Social Reform	0	0	0	0	-
Total	37	100	29	100	

As can be seen from Table 7, nine of 29 metaphors (31%) are classified under the Social Order, and another six (21%) in the Cultural Transmission, while 14 (48%) fit into the Learner-Centered Growth view. There are no metaphors in the Social Reform again. Now that 54% of them have the unobtrusive guiding metaphor, it can be concluded that the initial trend for conventional images like the cook and theatre player in Table 8 has reversed, thanks to their improved field knowledge. According to Can et al. (2011: 117), the predominance of the guiding metaphor implies “a step forward in defining the scope of teaching” and a greater precision in their understanding of the components of language teaching.

**Tablo 8.** *Examples of Final Teacher Metaphors*

Type <sup>b</sup>	Final Teacher Metaphors
O	An EFL teacher is like the cook, students vegetables, class the pot. The cook prepares vegetables and put them in the pot. Students are now ready to be cooked (=to be taught). The cook makes cooking. Also, the teacher directs the class. He is the mastery of learning, without him students can't learn. The teacher uses materials to teach better. The cook uses salt and pepper. He evaluates students with exams. If they lack information, he provides extra materials. The cook tastes meal and if it lacks salt and pepper, he adds it. The teacher teaches according to a syllabus, like the cook according to recipe.
T	An EFL teacher is like a theatre player that transports ideas, emotions, facts and values to students. Learning is what they get from lesson like an audience in the saloon. Teacher's job is to bring necessary knowledge (the script) with acting skills to students. He shouldn't make mistakes because students are ignorant and will take what they see as truth. Students are respectful and wait silently during the lecture. Their reactions are feedback like a theatre audience applauds what they like and remain silent if they don't understand. Then, he can tell the part one more time.
G	An EFL teacher is like a guide in a labyrinthe because he helps students like foreign tourists to find the most proper way to reach knowledge. Learners first try to find the way alone. Teacher contributes when they get confused and feel desperate. He provides motivation, cares about their mood and abilities. Class is like a labyrinthe because it is not always as easy as thought, rather complicated, full of irrelevant and incorrect information. So, learning is built by teacher's and students' efforts.
R	-

<sup>b</sup>O: social order; T: cultural transmission; G: learner-centred growth; R: social reform

Farrell's (2006: 240) case study of the metaphors three preservice teachers used before, during and after a six-week practicum in Singapore yielded similar results: i. their metaphors were organized around the social order, cultural transmission and learner-centered growth types; and ii. their initial perceptions evolved from the traditional images of the teacher as "general and missionary"; through the "culture broker"; into more learner-centered conceptions like the "mother, facilitator, motivator and mentor".

In the same way, the results of the post-training questionnaire in Can et al. (2011: 114) indicated that the Turkish participants, who "enter the teacher training programmes with a rather traditional view on the role of the foreign language teacher", chose the guide metaphor as the most prevalent. Also, the metaphors of orchestra director, commander, parent/caregiver and coach in Can et al. (2011) are shared by the Turkish sophomores in the current study: the teacher is described as "a master of an orchestra who guides the

flow of the music” (learners as “instrument players in a concert hall”) by S4, and as “a babysitter who looks after the children playing in the sand pool” by S28.

Can et al. (2011: 117) pointed out that the Turkish participants generated the metaphors of “building a structure, illuminating the unknown, conserving nature, and directing a film”, which “did not appear in the Polish group”. Correspondingly, S5 and S20 have produced the metaphors of the “headworker who works with other workers to complete the building”, and “film director who manages and works in harmony with an enthusiastic group of actors”. In addition to their parallel move from the traditional to more learner-centered metaphors, these Turkish participants develop the conception of the teacher as a more knowledgeable learning partner. This parallelism in their choice over specific metaphors might be culture-specific, as concluded by Can et al. (2011: 117): “Teaching is constrained by culture and cultural/social contexts in which it is performed”.

Another interesting finding from Table 7 is that the proponents of the Social Order have slightly increased by 6%, although the number of those with the Cultural Transmission has been reduced to half. A closer study of the metaphors in the Social Order also shows that a few metaphors like the fitness trainer, dog trainer, animal tamer with a whip and chicken farmer not only have negative connotations but also manifest a behaviouristic view of learning. In S21’s metaphor, learners are “animals captured in a circus” and the teacher is “the authority trying to make a tiger dance” by using “standard methods or principles” like “punishing with a whip or gifting them with meat (grades)”. Similarly, S3 resembles him to “a fitness trainer, who shows correct steps to get fit”, and learners to “trainees, who listen, watch and imitate the trainer”. Language is viewed as “muscles” and learning as “a physical activity”, so “this idea of exercising and muscle building” can be traced to behaviourism, considering the emphasis on demonstration, reinforcement, standardization and accuracy (Guerrero & Villamil, 2000: 347; Guerrero & Villamil, 2002: 113).

Martinez et al. (2001) condensed the Social Order and Cultural Transmission into the behaviourist category and obtained similar results with 50 experienced teachers: behaviourist metaphors amounting to 57% and to 59% initially in the current study. Despite the decline over time, behaviourist metaphors (52%) dominate in the present study and situative metaphors (corresponding to the Social Reform category) are non-existent, which amounted to only 5% in Martinez et al. (2001). Further evidence is provided by Leavy et al.’s (2007) study with 124 prospective teachers: behaviourist metaphors falling from 49% to 42% and situative metaphors from 9% to 6%. The increasing trend of constructivist metaphors (corresponding to the Learner-Centred Growth category) is valid for both studies: constructivist metaphors increasing from 24% to 44% in Leavy et al. (2007) and from 41% to 48% in the present study.

The enduring presence of behaviourist metaphors is primarily accounted by a phenomenon, termed “the apprentice of observation”, whereby teacher candidates, unlike “novices learning other professions such as those of lawyers or doctors”, watch their teacher’s performance for a long time (Borg, 2004: 274). Because this apprenticeship “is largely held responsible for many of [their] preconceptions” about teaching, the proponents of the Social Order and Cultural Transmission views can be claimed to be under the influence of their past learning experiences with traditional models of teachers or it may be reflective of “methods of teaching that are modeled in teacher education institutes” (Borg, 2004: 274; Leavy et al., 2007: 1227).

The fact that no metaphors are found in the Social Reform category is disappointing despite much discussion on social learning. Martinez et al. (2001: 973) found it problematic “to reflect on learning and to decide about teaching approaches today without at least considering... socially distributed intelligence” and stated teacher training often develops the explicit knowledge of preservice teachers, while the tacit knowledge informing their actions stay unchanged. However, Borg (2006: 65) argued that the lack of change between a participant’s pre- and post-course beliefs do not necessarily imply limited impact, as it “can also take the form of reinforcement in prior cognitions”. Now that the proponents of the Learner-Centered Growth view have increased and the coach, guide, navigator, and parent metaphors have recurred, students’ exposure to the theories of language learning may have helped to affirm their prior beliefs.

### **CONCLUSION**

Metaphor can be viewed as both product and process: the former relates to its use as “a method for investigating how people conceptualize their worlds” and the latter to the diachronic approach to be adopted in its analysis, so that the development of their understanding can be demonstrated through metaphorical changes over time (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2009: 332). Therefore, 138 metaphors about language and teaching were elicited from 37 sophomores before and after taking the course, Approaches to ELT. The metaphor analysis indicated a move from the traditional conceptions of language as structure and teacher as molder/knower to the modern understanding of language as communicative tool and teacher as facilitating partner. It is considered positive that 70% adopted functional and interactional views of language and 54% ended up with a learner-centered, constructivist view of teaching. However, it is found problematic that the behaviourist view of teaching was maintained by 46% and a participatory view was supported by none. The reappearance of the Social Order and Cultural Transmission metaphors does not suggest limited impact for the course, however. It is known that “student teachers arrive for their training courses having spent thousands of hours as schoolchildren observing and evaluating professionals in action” (Borg, 2004: 274).

Their prior experiences with traditional teachers influence “the personal beliefs and images that preservice candidates bring to programs of teacher education” and unless examined metaphorically, they “usually remain inflexible”, as “candidates tend to use the information provided in coursework to confirm rather than to confront and correct their preexisting beliefs” (Kagan, 1992: 154). The metaphor analysis proved useful for raising awareness about their underlying theories of language and teaching, which in turn “will spell out governing principles for choosing certain methods and techniques” (Brown, 2007: 8). Besides revealing their world views, examining metaphors led them to see if their former beliefs “are still relevant given the curriculum they have been presented in the teacher education program” (Farrell, 2006: 245; Hall, 2011). This also helped the instructor to evaluate the developmental change in their (re)conceptualizations. In conclusion, teacher educators shouldn't be content with “imparting knowledge about teaching” and must help student teachers to explore their philosophies of teaching in the entry-practicum-induction phases of becoming a teacher, and “to plot and monitor their own professional growth” by using metaphor analysis (Leavy et al., 2007: 1230, Saban et al., 2006).

### REFERENCES

- Alger, C. L. (2009). Secondary Teachers' Conceptual Metaphors of Teaching and Learning: Changes over the Career Span. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 25 (5), 743-751. [Online]: Retrieved on 14-May-2012, at URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X08001777>
- Borg, M. (2004). The Apprenticeship of Observation. *ELT Journal* 58 (3), 274-276. [Online]: Retrieved on 11-December-2011, at URL: <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/58/3/274.full.pdf+html>
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher Cognition and Language Education*. London: Continuum.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Cameron, L. & Low, G. (1999). Metaphor. *Language Teaching* 32 (2), 77-96. [Online]: Retrieved on 15-January-2011, at URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800013781>
- Can, C., Bedir, H. & Kilianska-Przybylo, G. (2011). Is Teaching Culture-Bound? A Cross-Cultural Study on the Beliefs of ELT Teachers, J. Arabski & A. Wojtaszek (Eds.) *Aspects of Culture in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 107-120). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Cerit, Y. (2008a). Öğrenci, Öğretmen ve Yöneticilerin Müdür Kavramı ile İlgili Metaforlara İlişkin Görüşleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim* 33 (147), 3-13. [Online]: Retrieved on 16-March-2012, at URL: <http://egitimvebilim.ted.org.tr/index.php/EB/article/viewFile/682/132>
- Cerit, Y. (2008b). Öğretmen Kavramı ile İlgili Metaforlara İlişkin Öğrenci, Öğretmen ve Yöneticilerin Görüşleri. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi* 6 (4), 693-712. [Online]: Retrieved on 16-March-2012, at URL: [http://www.tebd.gazi.edu.tr/arsiv/2008\\_cilt6/sayi\\_4/693-712.pdf](http://www.tebd.gazi.edu.tr/arsiv/2008_cilt6/sayi_4/693-712.pdf)
- Ciambrone, D. (2004). Anonymity, M.S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman & T. F. Liao (Eds.) *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods* (pp. 18-19). California: SAGE Publications.
- Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1999). Bridges to Learning: Metaphors of Teaching, Learning and Language, L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.) *Researching and Applying Metaphor* (pp. 149-176). New York: Cambridge University Press.



- Ellis, R. & Barkhuizen, G. (2009). *Analysing Learner Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2006). 'The Teacher is an Octopus': Uncovering Preservice English Language Teachers' Prior Beliefs through Metaphor Analysis. *RELC Journal* 37 (2), 236-248. [Online]: Retrieved on 18-March-2012, at URL: <http://rel.sagepub.com/citmgr?gca=sprel:37/2/236>
- Gök, B. & Erdoğan, T. (2010). Investigation of Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions about Concept of Technology through Metaphor Analysis. *TOJET* 9 (2), 145-160. [Online]: Retrieved on 12-March-2012, at URL: <http://www.tojet.net/articles/v9i2/9216.pdf>
- Guerrero, M. C. M. & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Exploring ESL Teachers' Roles through Metaphor Analysis. *TESOL Quarterly* 34 (2), 341-351. [Online]: Retrieved on 13-February-2012, at URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587960>
- Guerrero, M. C. M. & Villamil, O. S. (2002). Metaphorical Conceptualizations of ESL Teaching and Learning. *Language Teaching Research* 6 (2), 95-120. [Online]: Retrieved on 13-February-2012, at URL: <http://ltr.sagepub.com/citmgr?gca=spltr:6/2/95>
- Gürol, M. & Donmuş, V. (2010). Metaphors Created by Prospective Teachers Related to the Concept of "Social Network". *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 9, 1489-1496. [Online]: Retrieved on 14-April-2012, at URL: [http://perweb.firat.edu.tr/personel/yayinlar/fua\\_39/39\\_61464.pdf](http://perweb.firat.edu.tr/personel/yayinlar/fua_39/39_61464.pdf)
- Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English Language Teaching: Language in Action*. New York: Routledge.
- Herron, C. (1982). Foreign-Language Learning Approaches as Metaphor. *The Modern Language Journal* 66 (3), 235-242. [Online]: Retrieved on 17-July-2012, at URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/326625>
- Hongqin, Z. & Jianbin, H. (2008). Interpreting Metaphor in Use by Mandarin Teachers of English. *Polyglossia* 15, 1-9. [Online]: Retrieved on 10-February-2012, at URL: [http://www.apu.ac.jp/rcaps/modules/publication/index.php?content\\_id=48&lang=english](http://www.apu.ac.jp/rcaps/modules/publication/index.php?content_id=48&lang=english)
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional Growth among Preservice and Beginning Teachers. *Review of Educational Research* 62 (2), 129-169. [Online]: Retrieved on 10-September-2012, at URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1170578>
- Kesen, A. (2010). Turkish EFL Learners' Metaphors with Respect to English Language Coursebooks. *Novitas-ROYAL: Research on Youth and Language* 4 (1), 108-118. [Online]: Retrieved on 17-April-2012, at URL: [http://novitasroyal.org/Vol\\_4\\_1/kesen.pdf](http://novitasroyal.org/Vol_4_1/kesen.pdf)
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live by*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1990). *Language Teaching Methods*. Washington: The Agency.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leavy, A. M., McSorley, F. A. & Boté, L. A. (2007). An Examination of What Metaphor Construction Reveals about the Evolution of Preservice Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching and Learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 23 (7), 1217-1233. [Online]: Retrieved on 10-May-2012, at URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X06001211>
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing Qualitative Research*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Martinez, M. A., Sauleda, N. & Güenter, L. H. (2001). Metaphors as Blueprints of Thinking about Teaching and Learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 17 (8), 965-977. [Online]: Retrieved on 10-May-2012, at URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X01000439>
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Nikitina, L. & Furuoka, F. (2008). "A Language Teacher is Like...": Examining Malaysian Students' Perceptions of Language Teachers through Metaphor Analysis. *Electronic*

- Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 5 (2), 192-205. [Online]: Retrieved on 15-June-2012, at URL: <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v5n22008/nikitina.pdf>
- Ocak, G. & Gündüz, M. (2006). Eğitim Fakültesini Yeni Kazanan Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğretmenlik Mesleğine Giriş Dersini Almadan Önce ve Aldıktan Sonra Öğretmenlik Mesleği Hakkındaki Metaforlarının Karşılaştırılması. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 8 (2), 293-311. [Online]: Retrieved on 02-June-2012, at URL: <http://www.aku.edu.tr/AKU/DosyaYonetimi/SOSYALBILENS/dergi/VIII2/gocak.pdf>
- Oxford, R. L., Tomlinson, S., Barcelos, A., Harrington, C., Lavine, R. Z., Saleh, A. & Longhini, A. (1998). Clashing metaphors about classroom teachers: toward a systematic typology for the language teaching field. *System* 26 (1), 3-50. [Online]: Retrieved on 20-March-2012, at URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X97000717>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Saban, A., Koçbeker, B. & Saban, A. (2006). An Investigation of the Concept of the Teacher among Prospective Teachers through Metaphor Analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* 6(2), 509-522. [Online]: Retrieved on 11-May-2012, at URL: <http://www.edam.com.tr/kuyeb/pdf/en/086a8a2e38724a961f3655b57175515baneng.pdf>
- Saban, A., Koçbeker, B. & Saban, A. (2007). Prospective Teachers' Conceptions of Teaching and Learning Revealed through Metaphor Analysis. *Learning and Instruction* 17 (2), 123-139. [Online]: Retrieved on 11-May-2012, at URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959475207000047>
- Saban, A. (2010). Prospective Teachers' Metaphorical Conceptualizations of Learner. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26 (2), 290-305. [Online]: Retrieved on 11-May-2012, at URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X09000857>
- Saban, A. (2011). Prospective Computer Teachers' Mental Images about the Concepts of "School" and "Computer Teacher". *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* 11 (1), 435-446. [Online]: Retrieved on 10-May-2012, at URL: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=EJ919910>
- Shakespeare, W. (2007). *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. London: Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Silverman, D. & Marvasti, A. (2008). *Doing Qualitative Research: A Comprehensive Guide*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Undergraduate Program Course Descriptions (2011). In *METU FLE*. Retrieved on 30-October-2012, at URL: [https://catalog.metu.edu.tr/course.php?course\\_code=4500238](https://catalog.metu.edu.tr/course.php?course_code=4500238)
- Wan, W., Low, G. D. & Li, M. (2011). From Students' and Teachers' Perspectives: Metaphor Analysis of Beliefs about EFL Teachers' Roles. *System* 39 (3), 403-415. [Online]: Retrieved on 08-March-2012, at URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X11000984>
- White, B. & Smith, M. W. (1994). Metaphors in English Education: Putting Things in Perspective. *English Education* 26 (3), 157-176. [Online]: Retrieved on 20-August-2012, at URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40172806>
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.