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Özet
Bu çalışmanın amacı, Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü öğrencilerinin İngilizce öğretmenliği ile ilgili yazdıkları kompozisyonlardan elde edilmişdir. Çalışmanın verileri 102 öğrencinin İngilizce öğretmeni ile ilgili yazdıkları kompozisyonlardan elde edilmişdir. Toplanan veriler içerik analizi ile incelenmiş ve kullanılan metaforlar, ve metaforları içeren cümlelerdeki fiil, sıfat ve zarflar belirlenmiştir. Elde edilen veriler, istatiksel olarak incelenmiş ve yüzdelikleri hesaplanmıştır.
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Abstract
This study aims to investigate EFL teacher candidates’ metaphors regarding English language teachers. The data was collected through 102 teacher candidates’ essays written on their views of being an EFL teachers and teaching. The metaphors were qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed. Content analysis of the essays revealed a total of 134 metaphors categorized in four groups: people, objects, actions and animals. The verbs, adjectives and adverbs in the host statements of metaphors were also investigated and were categorized into two groups, namely focus on self-development and focus on other-development. Percentages were calculated and given for metaphors, verbs, adjectives and adverbs in each category.
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Introduction
Research in foreign language learning and teaching has been expanding in terms of both research quantities and methods employed in those studies. Especially over the past few decades, a growing number of researchers have investigated the use of metaphors and figurative language as a subject of study and as a method of inquiry. In a traditional sense, metaphor research originated during antiquity as a form of rhetoric investigation. However, in modern times, metaphor studies fall under the broad scheme of cognitive semantic research which investigates meaning and its relation to cognition. Metaphor studies emerged in the 1970s and involved presenting metaphors as a fundamental mechanism through which individual perceptions and actions are shaped. After the second millennia, metaphor studies proliferated in the field of cognitive linguistics (Lakeoff & Randal, 2004).

Metaphors are reflections of mental models and represent the analogical reasoning and problem-solving processes of the speaker (East, 2009). The term “metaphor” stems from the Greek word “metapherin”, which simply means “to transfer”. To be more concise, Merriam-Webster’s dictionary defines metaphor as “a figure of speech in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them”. In another definition, metaphors are defined as “the result of associating certain concrete and abstract concepts to each
other, not by a pure flight of fancy, but because they entail or implicate each other” (Kövecses, 2002, p. 39). On the other end of the spectrum, metaphors in linguistics are considered a mapping between conceptual domains, primarily a source domain and a target domain (Lakoff, 1993). This mapping is realized in a way in which knowledge about the source domain is used to make statements about the target domain. Then, the person listening to these statements uses his/her knowledge to make sense of the metaphor. The analysis of metaphors, therefore, has the potential to yield comprehensive explanation on the construction of metaphors, which pave the way for making sense of the world. One main advantage of the use of metaphor as a methodology is that it provides a tool for scrutinizing the relationship between language and other mental processes, an enquiry that is producing the field known as cognitive linguistics (Holme, 2004). For Glucksberg, metaphors require the transport of new information, insight or perspective to the listener or reader (Glucksberg, 2001). Otherwise, simply paraphrasing or utilizing figurative language terms or rhetorical devices is not metaphor but restatement. As the details of what constitutes a good metaphor is not in the framework of the present study, they are not elaborated here but instead some components touched upon.

There are four basic components of metaphors: source, target, mapping, and context. The source is defined as the object, person or idea from which certain attributes are borrowed, and the target is the object, person or idea to which these attributes are assigned. The mechanism employed in the construction of a metaphor is the mapping process, in which the attributes of the source are matched with those of the target. Another important component of metaphors is the context. Context has a determinant role in both construction by the source domain and decoding by the target domain (Zhang & Hu, 2009). As a consequence, researchers conducting metaphor studies should take a pragmatic stance and consider context in their analyses.

In the literature, there are metaphor classification studies for students, teachers and others (Bozlk, 2002; Oxford et al., 1998; Saban et al., 2006; Saban, 2006). One of the major classification studies focusing on language classrooms determined four philosophical categories for metaphors: social order perspective, cultural transmission perspective, learner-centred growth perspective and social reform perspective (Oxford et al., 1998). In Bozlk’s classification, metaphors were grouped into animal metaphors, object metaphors, human metaphors, and action metaphors (Bozlk, 2002). Moreover, metaphors for teachers were investigated and categorised as knowledge provider, molder/craftsperson, curer/reparer, superior authority figure, change agent, entertainer, nurturer/cultivator, archetype of spirit, facilitator/scaffolder, cooperative/democratic leader (Saban et al., 2006). For the purposes of this study, pre-service EFL teachers’ metaphors were categorized based on the models developed by Bozlk (2002) and Saban et al., (2006).

Metaphors in Education and EFL

The use of metaphors in education is a common practice in classroom activities whether extensively or sparsely (Arslan, M. & Bayrakci, M., 2006). In a review study, Jensen (2006) classified metaphors based on their use in educational research. According to Jensen (2006) metaphors are used in education to raise awareness for modern metaphors and metaphoric usage within an educational setting; to develop techniques and procedures for measuring, understanding, and interpreting the use and instruction of metaphors in education; to explore the usage, implementation, and/or analysis of educational metaphors; and to investigate how participants use metaphors to describe existing educational states (Jensen, 2006). The roles of metaphor in education are summarized below:

- constitutive to the educational policies we devise, e.g. the “market” metaphor or school choice (goods, services, consumers).
- constitutive of the teaching process (e.g. teaching as orchestration, conditioning, guiding or training).
- function heuristically as a tool for discovery (spiral staircase or ladder).
- function didactically as approaches to teaching (dramatization and role playing).
- qualify the teaching actions of the teacher (pottery, gardening, artistry, policeman, entertainer, sermonizer, scholar, a guide, a coach, a researcher, a sculptor, conductor, gardener, mid-wife, etc.).
- determine the way the learner or learning process is seen (sponge, filter, funnel, and strainer).
- represent characteristic of the content of the subject matter that is being taught and this in turn is often determined by the curricular metaphors (system, mechanism, organism) within which the subject matter is taught.
- metaphors can function as tools for communication.
• mediate the understanding of the nature of the school as educational institution (family, factory, etc.) (Botha, 2009, p. 434).

Metaphor studies broadly fall into two mainstream categories in education literature. In the first group, researchers investigate the effectiveness of the use of metaphors as a tool for teaching (Arslan & Bayrakci, 2006; Martinez et al., 2001; Saban, 2006). In education, metaphors along with analogies are basically employed to create meaningful relations between the things students do and do not know. Consequently, utilizing existing knowledge to master new information facilitates the learning process in two ways: by activating schemata and by simplifying information (Kövecses, 2003). Specifically, metaphor research in EFL has dealt with various aspects of language-learning including but not limited to the development of pragmatics, sociolinguistics and lexicon. While teaching in an EFL classroom, teachers and learners are required to be familiar with not only the main competencies of the language, but also the concepts and cultural elements of the target community. Greves (2005) examined metaphors from a different perspective. The purpose of the study was to use metaphors as an important tool for raising pre-service teachers’ awareness about student diversity and teachers’ sensitivity towards it. The results pointed out that pedagogical discussions between teachers and pre-service teachers were helpful for bridging the gap between theory and practice and raising their awareness about pedagogical issues. Metaphors can therefore be viewed as an important tool for providing support to teachers and learners.

Lexical development in the target language is the first area in which conceptual metaphors are utilized in language classes (Zhang & Hu, 2009). Metaphors bring new terms and perspectives to a class and students are given the opportunity to familiarize themselves with these new lexical items in context. Lexical development is not limited by the addition of new vocabulary to learner corpus, but rather is improved in a way in which learners are presented with various metaphorical senses of the same vocabulary item in different contexts and domains. Therefore, a newly-learned or already-known lexical item could be improved by adding different senses in a different metaphorical domain. In a recent study (Kömür & Çimen, 2009), conceptual metaphors were used in an EFL context to teach idioms in Turkey. The researchers suggested that learners’ awareness of metaphors was improved and they were more successful in understanding idiomatic expressions. The authors recommend metaphors as an effective tool for teaching idiomatic expressions and improving students’ lexicon.

In the second strand of metaphor studies, research concerns the teacher’s, student’s, teacher candidate’s, etc.’s mental representations of certain constructs by using metaphors as a research tool (Kövecses, 2003; Lakeoff & Randal, 2004; Oxford et al., 1998; Zhang & Hu, 2009; Alger, 2009). These literary tools are therefore considered an “important tool of cognition and communication” (Ortony & Fainsilber, 1989, p. 181). In this group of research, metaphors regarding education in general, teaching, teachers, learning, learners, schools, administration, course books, etc. were collected from teachers, teacher candidates, learners, administrators, and even parents.

For education in general, 336 freshmen teacher candidates’ metaphors about university and academic staff were investigated in a recent study. The results indicated that teacher candidates used metaphors such as cultural variety, free places for university and a guide for academic staff (Koşar, 2016). In another study with classroom teachers, Koç investigated 169 candidate teachers’ use of metaphors. Interestingly, she found some negative metaphors for the teaching profession (Koç, 2014). Furthermore, in another study by Arslan (2013) with classroom teachers teaching in multi-grade classes, the teachers’ perceptions of being a teacher were searched through metaphors. The results revealed that, teachers were generally thought as knowledge provider, supporter of individual growth, director, guide and model of patience. The metaphors produced by the pre-service Turkish teachers for the concept of teacher were searched by Aytan (2014). The findings yielded that the role of teacher as a knowledge provider and transferring knowledge were the most emphasized ones. Another important finding was that teachers were generally considered as guide, molder and producer. In an English language teaching context, there are studies specifically investigating pre-service and in-service EFL teachers’ metaphors. In one, Şimşek studied the metaphors of 26 pre-service EFL teachers before and after their practicum (Simsek, 2014). She concluded that practicum improved pre-service teachers’ perceptions of being an EFL teacher by “abandoning the idea of a teacher as an all-knowing authority delivering information, shaping and controlling learners” (p. 941). Similarly, in an EFL context, pre-service and in-service EFL teachers’ metaphors were investigated to unearth the schemata for thinking
about “teachers” (Seferoğlu et al., 2009). They found that pre and in-service teachers generally described teachers as a guide, facilitator and as a source person. In another study, 109 young EFL learners in the 8th grade of secondary school and their parents (N: 66) were asked to construct metaphors for learning English (Coşkun, 2015). Then, metaphors were categorized as positive, negative, ambivalent and neutral. A comparison of the parent and learner groups revealed that parents had more positive metaphors about language learning than did learners. In a similar setting Nikitina and Furuoka (2008) investigated students’ metaphors about language teachers and classified 27 metaphors they found into Oxford et al. (1998)’s categories. Interestingly enough, they found a connection between learners’ metaphorical images and gender; however, the statistical analysis did not prove the significance of such a difference based on gender.

Currently, there exists a collection of research pertaining metaphors and the classification of metaphors for learners, pre-service and in-service teachers. However, to the best of the researchers’ knowledge, the lexical selection of statements has not been explored. Thus, this study investigated pre-service EFL teachers’ metaphors regarding the teaching profession. Accordingly, the following research questions were constructed to guide this study:

1. What are the metaphors of pre-service EFL teachers about being a language teacher?
2. What are the lexical categories used in the host statements of metaphors?

**Method**

**Research Design**

The present research was a descriptive study conducted to determine the metaphorical representations of EFL pre-service teachers about the concept of being a language teacher. Both qualitative and quantitative research paradigms were employed. The qualitative part included frequencies of number of metaphors and number of lexical items, i.e. verbs, adverbs and adjectives. For the qualitative part, content analysis was conducted to categorise metaphors.

**Participants**

The participants of this study were 102 pre-service EFL teachers studying at a state university in Turkey during the second semester of the 2015-16 academic year. 28 participants were freshmen students, including 22 females and 6 males. There were 49 sophomores including 40 female and 9 male students. The third group consisted of 25 juniors, 20 of whom were females and 5 of whom were males. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 22. The number of female pre-service EFL teachers (N= 82) was more than the number of male (N= 20) pre-service EFL teachers.

**Data Collection**

Prior to collecting data, all participants were provided necessary background information regarding the definition of metaphor, its creation, and some examples. Thus, we tried to prevent any possible misunderstandings. In order to investigate Turkish pre-service EFL teachers’ conceptions of foreign language teaching, they were asked to compose an essay response to the question, “What do you think about what a language teacher is like?”. The essay was assigned as homework so as to give them sufficient time for reflection. They had to hand in their essays the following week and there was no limitation for the length of writing. The reasons for asking participants to construct an essay were various. First of all, we aimed to obtain more detailed data. Secondly, it was thought that implied language might guide us in discovering pre-service teacher perceptions of what a language teacher is like. Lastly, definitions and explanations provided for each metaphor were expected to help us during the data analysis process.

**Data Analysis**

In order to organize and analyze data, initially all essays written by the participants were read by the researchers. Later, all generated metaphors were listed verbatim along with definitions and
explanations supplied. While doing this, metaphors including participants’ perceptions of language teachers were included and irrelevant ones were excluded. Following this, the researchers applied content analysis in order to categorize the metaphors. During the categorization process, researchers consulted two studies which had suggested two different categorizations. One study is that of Bozlk (2002), who had asked college students to create metaphors for themselves as learners at different stages. The findings revealed four categorizations: animal metaphors, object metaphors, human metaphors and action metaphors. This classification was used to categorize emergent metaphors. The second stage of the analysis was how to categorize the explanations provided for each metaphor. For this purpose, we utilized another classification proposed by Saban et al., (2006). In their study, Saban et al., (2006) researched the metaphors used by student-teachers who were attending different programs within the Faculty of Education. After analyzing data, they classified the metaphors created by student-teachers into ten categories: teacher as knowledge-provider, teacher as molder/craftperson, teacher as curer/repairer, teacher as superior authority figure, teacher as entertainer, teacher as archetype of spirit, teacher as nurturer/cultivator, teacher as facilitator/scaffolder, and teacher as cooperative democratic leader. After categorization, we asked two outside researchers to independently sort the data into categories in order to assess the consistency of the coding system and categorizations provided by the researchers. For this purpose, two researchers were given two categorizations and emergent metaphors. After the initial analysis of the data, researchers compared their categorizations against each other’s and discussed the problematic ones. After this discussion, these metaphors were categorized as not applicable and excluded from the analysis (N=9).

Results and Discussion

In order to identify Turkish pre-service EFL teachers’ conceptions regarding language-teaching, all metaphors created by the participants were analyzed and then codified according to Bozlk (2002)’s classification. The results are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Classification of metaphors according to Bozlk (2002)’s categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Metaphor Example</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1. Ant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Candle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Diamond</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Well etc...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>1. Mother</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Artist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Engineer etc..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>1. Learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1. Learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 1, the metaphors produced by student-teachers were grouped under four themes. Among these themes, the human theme received the highest frequency and percentage. That is, 100 metaphors associated with human beings were created while describing what a language teacher is like (81.3%). As indicated in Table 1, language teachers are seen as mothers, artists, guides, doctors and engineers. It can be inferred that for EFL student-teachers, language teachers possess various characteristics belonging to different occupations. For instance, one participant described associated language teachers as tourist guides and explained the following:
Excerpt 1: "Language teachers are like tourist guides. They show us different places and the paths we will walk for the travel” (participant 30).

The second category of metaphors having the highest frequency was object. The participants produced 21 metaphors under the theme of object for language teachers (17%). For instance, some described language teachers as bridges, candles, books and diamonds and different features of each were associated with language teachers. For example, while one EFL student stated the following:

Excerpt 2: "Language teachers are like candles; they lighten their students’ path” (participant 46).

Metaphors under the themes animal and action followed these two categories with just one metaphor for each (.81%). One participant used the metaphor of an ant under the theme animal and one participant used the learning process as a metaphor under the theme action. We can say that Turkish pre-service EFL teachers use metaphors associated with human characteristics and object features more frequently than metaphors recalling features of animals and actions.

After the categorization of metaphors, another classification regarding the reasoning behind metaphors was also applied by researchers. For this purpose, they made use of a more detailed classification developed by Saban et al., (2006). The rationale for this classification was our expectation that it might include and describe the metaphors created by participants in the present study. The results are displayed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Classification of metaphors according to Saban et al., (2006)’s categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme (Teacher as...)</th>
<th>Metaphor &amp; Explanation</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge provider</td>
<td>Book (when you read, you learn a lot)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molder/craftperson</td>
<td>Flourishing tree (having unique skills, ideas, thoughts and experiences)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curer/repairer</td>
<td>Counsellor (finds solutions to students’ problems)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior/authority figure</td>
<td>Boss (direct students because they need to be directed)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change agent</td>
<td>Guide (directs students for effective learning)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer</td>
<td>Clown (create a colorful and warm environment)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturer/cultivator</td>
<td>Mother (takes care of her students, teach them about real life and protect them)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archetype of spirit</td>
<td>Writer (has strong feelings, understands her students)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator/scaffolder</td>
<td>Coach (cares and guides students)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative/democratic leader</td>
<td>Dictator (balances both praise and anger, when necessary)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates that 132 metaphors were created concerning different roles identified by student-teachers. Among the themes in this categorization, teacher as knowledge provider had the highest frequency and percentage. 25 metaphors were produced by the EFL student-teachers in order
to explain that teachers are the source and transmitter of knowledge (18.9%). For instance, one participant thought that language teachers are like books and explained the following:

Excerpt 3: "A language teacher is like a book. When you read, you learn a lot. After you read, your life changes. When you like it, you read more and more; thus, they can change your life" (participant 9).

The category with the second-highest frequency was teacher as facilitator/scaffolder (n=23; 17.42%). With these metaphors, student-teachers emphasized that one of the most important roles of teachers is to facilitate student learning. The teacher is a facilitator during the teaching and learning process. Following this, it is seen that according to student-teachers, a language teacher might be associated with teacher as archetype of spirit. 20 metaphors were created for this theme (15.15%). For instance, one EFL student explained the following:

Excerpt 4: "A language teacher is like a writer who has strong feelings...feelings of a writer are so strong, therefore they can understand their reader like language teachers. They can also understand their students" (participant 6).

Based on our findings, we can conclude that EFL student-teachers think that language teachers are considered role models; besides teaching, they have strong feelings to understand their students. The following 16 metaphors were produced under the theme of teacher as nurturer/cultivator (12.12%). Of these metaphors, most participants associated language teachers with parents. They identified language teachers as mothers or fathers who are protecting, caring and nourishing. Teacher as molder/craftperson was another theme which had 15 metaphors (11.36%). Of the metaphors created under this theme, student-teachers most commonly referenced the art of teaching and the teaching process as well as how language teachers contribute their students’ learning while teaching a target language. Teacher as change agent was another theme which received 9 metaphors (6.81%). Here, participants tried to explain that a language teacher is a social agent and while teaching another language; moreover, they contribute to students’ social-cultural development. Just seven metaphors were used to explain teacher as superior authority/figure (5.3%). Under this theme, student-teachers focused on classroom management skills. Teacher as curer/repairer and teacher as cooperative/democratic leader were themes with the lowest frequency (n=3; 2.27%). Only three metaphors were used for each theme. It can be inferred that EFL student-teachers might not be aware of these characteristics of language teachers.

To obtain more detailed information related to metaphors used by pre-service EFL teachers, lexical categories in the host statements of metaphors were also examined. The findings indicated that verb and adjective categories used in these explanations might also be informative. The verbs used in these host statements were classified into two categories. The first category focus on self-development represents verbs related to teachers’ personal development. The results are displayed in Table 3 below. The second category is focus on others’ development, which is related to verbs representing teacher support and contributions to the development of others. The frequency and percentage of each category are described in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Verb categories used by EFL pre-service teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Themes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know, have, believe, understand, consider, follow, feel, use etc..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage, motivate, guide, help, praise, support, direct, suggest etc..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 3, the number of the verbs used for focus on self-development and focus on others’ development were very close to each other. 79 verbs were used for focus on others’ development (53.24%) while 68 verbs were used for focus on self-development in the host statements of the metaphors created by EFL pre-service teachers (46.25%). It can be inferred that pre-service EFL
teachers believe that language teachers are trying to develop other people and contribute their personal and professional development as well as their own personal and professional development.

In addition to verb categorization, the adjectives used in the host statements were also investigated. Via content analysis, they were classified into two categories. The results are shown in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Academic Qualities</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Personal Qualities</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluent, careful, important etc.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>Patient, calm, friendly etc.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 indicates that the frequency of adjectives used for the personality of teachers is greater than (n=43; 68.16%) the frequency of adjectives used for academic qualities. Pre-service EFL teachers generally focused on the characteristics of teachers’ personalities. For instance, being patient, calm and friendly are associated with language teachers. It was also found that among the adjectives used for personality, teachers as being innovative was most emphasized one (n=17; 26.9). Findings revealed that language teachers should have a good personality and are also expected to be innovative and creative. This is followed by the academic qualities of language teachers. 20 adjectives were used in the host statements of metaphors to explain the academic qualities of language teachers (31.74%). It can be inferred that for pre-service EFL teachers, academic qualities are as important as personality.

Considering the findings in Table 4, we can imply that the portrait of a language teacher in EFL teachers’ minds is versatile. They think that language teachers generally have good personalities and are qualified, as evidenced by the use of positive adjectives in the host statements of the metaphors they created. In addition to personal qualities, they felt that they needed to clarify teacher personality. They generally believe that language teachers are creative and imaginative people. While teaching a language, being innovative is considered essential.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Through the analysis of the pre-service EFL teachers’ metaphors about language teachers, the current study investigated the types of metaphors and lexical items in the host statements which is an under-researched topic in the field. Metaphors are important tools for understanding the cognitive patterns that teachers develop regarding any given concept (Botha, 2009). Teachers’ practice and identity might be recognized with an understanding of metaphors they use to explain language teaching (Nguyen, 2016). Through the use of metaphor analysis, EFL teacher candidates’ conceptualizations about being a language teacher were investigated in this study. Teacher education could benefit from metaphor research which is important in revealing teachers’ implicit concepts about teaching (Greves, 2005; Inbar, 1996; McGrath, 2006; Yob, 2003). Metaphors also reveal certain preferences of teachers about their classroom practices as explained by Tobin & Tippins (1996). Teacher who see themselves as the captain in the classroom tend to exercise strict control over the classroom, on the other hand teachers who use the entertainer metaphor tend to have enjoyable classes. Experienced teachers bring their practical knowledge into the classroom and therefore conceptualize their role in the classroom as craftsperson. Interestingly enough in our study, pre-service EFL teachers also envisioned themselves as ‘craftsperson’ in language classes. It is, therefore, safe to assume that pre-service EFL teachers share the common idea of teacher in language classes as experienced teachers, which is language teachers are seen as craft persons.

The findings are significant because, to the best of the researchers’ knowledge, the host statements of the metaphors were investigated for the first time in terms of their use of lexical items, i.e. verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Through the investigation of verbs, adjectives and adverbs in the host statements of metaphors, a deeper understanding of the conceptualizations was made possible. The findings of the content analysis of the host statements supported the previous categorizations made by Bozlk (2002) and Saban et al., (2006). The results revealed that language teachers are generally
knowledge providers and facilitators, which is supported by the findings of the verb and adjective categorization.

Metaphors and metaphor investigations proved to be a fruitful method for professional development in teacher education (Zhao, et al., 2010). Pre-service EFL teachers generally believe that language teachers provide knowledge for their learners and try to facilitate the students' learning process (Jensen, 2006; Lakeoff & Randal, 2004). This also supports the findings of verb categorization, namely that language teachers contribute to the development of themselves as well as others.

The adjective and verb categorizations indicate that positive adjectives and contributory verbs were generally associated with language teachers. It might be interpreted that Turkish pre-service EFL teachers believe that language teachers give particular importance to personal and professional development. When the results are generally considered, it is seen that the most frequently used metaphors concern characteristics related to human beings, which also supports the classification of Saban et al., (2006).

The results of this study demonstrate that metaphors studies might be helpful for teacher trainers, pre and in-service teachers. As explained by Greeves (2005), teachers might raise awareness about diversity among learners, which might guide them during teaching process. Thus, teachers can qualify their teaching actions and contribute to the professional development of their learners (Jensen, 2006).

All findings in this study reveal that while training language teachers, teacher trainers should consider the characteristics mentioned above. Similarly, those employed as language teachers as well as those aspiring to be language teachers should also possess these qualities since language teachers are generally expected to have these qualifications.

Limitations

One of the most important limitation of this study is the time period it covered. Metaphors of pre-service EFL teachers were collected through a single session of essay writing rather that multiple data collection sessions through the academic year. Another important point to note is the categorizations schemes used in this study. Participant metaphors were investigated through the categorizations of Bozlk (2002) and Saban et al., (2006). The participants of this study were students of only one university. In order to get a complete picture of EFL pre-service teachers' conceptualization of being a language teacher, a more comprehensive study is needed. The research can be expanded including more universities.
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