



Metaphorical Analysis of the Perceptions of the Primary School Students on the Concepts of "School, Teacher and Principal" *

Research Article

Mustafa OZGENEL¹, Betul Dondu GOKCE²

¹ Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Faculty of Education, Istanbul, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0002-7276-4865

² Kozyatağı Sukran Karabelli Primary School, Istanbul, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0003-4364-2647

To cite this article: Ozgenel, M. & Gokce, B. D. (2019). Metaphorical Analysis of the Perceptions of the Primary School Students on the Concepts of "School, Teacher and Principal", *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 11(1), 100-122.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 19.11.2018

Available online:

04.02.2019

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to determine and analyze the metaphors used by third and fourth grade students related to school, teachers and principals. Among qualitative research designs, phenomenological research design was used in the study. The study group consisted of 197 students (99 females and 98 males) studying at two state schools in Kadikoy District at Anatolian Side of Istanbul. Study group was determined using convenient sampling model. Content analysis technique as coding specific concepts and themes was used during qualitative data analysis. Students attributed 26 metaphors concerning the school, 27 metaphors concerning the teacher, and 27 metaphors concerning the school principal. Almost half of the students (48.7%) used "home" metaphor for the school, and almost half (49.7%) used "family" metaphor for the teacher. As for the principals, the most common metaphor was "leader" (23.9%). Findings of the study were discussed in the light of the related literature, and some suggestions for further studies were offered.

© 2019 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

School metaphor, teacher metaphor, principal metaphor, metaphoric analysis

Introduction

School, as an open and social system where education services are provided to individuals and society, is the bottom unit of whole education system. This education services are produced by teachers and directed by principals at schools. Teachers and principals have big responsibilities in order to apply teaching and learning at schools efficiently because teachers and principals are the most important elements of a qualified education (Adıgüzel, 2005). In other words, forming an efficient school requires efficient principals and efficient teachers (Can, 1998). As a director of a school, principals are individuals who are responsible for the

* A part of this research was presented as oral presentation in at the International Conference on Research in Education and Science (ICRES-2018, Marmaris, Muğla/Turkey).

¹ Corresponding author's address: Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Faculty of Education, Istanbul, TURKEY

Telephone: +90 212692895

e-mail: mustafa.ozgenel@izu.edu.tr

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2019.01.008>

quality of education, thus they affect the quality prominently (Leithwood, 2005). It is not easy for principals to struggle to improve the school on their own. Instead, including all stakeholders to the process starting with teachers (De Grauwe, 2005), and being a leader in teaching reflect positively to the quality of education and efficiency of the school. Moreover, teachers' taking active roles in this process has a critical importance in the success of the process. Efficiency and success of schools are determined by having students achieve the educational aims containing cognitive, affective, psychomotor, social, and aesthetic fields at an expected level along with achieving institutional and supervisory aims (Helvacı & Aydoğan, 2011). In other words, in order to consider a school successful and efficient, the most regarded and emphasized common indicators are student gains. Students, who are the target population, are affected by educational activities that principals and teachers perform. Thus, students' perceptions about the school, teachers and principals should be determined and considered carefully. One of the ways to reveal the perceptions or the conceptual understandings of students related to school, teachers, and principals is the analysis of metaphors (Kövecses, 2002). It is observed in educational field that many metaphor studies have been conducted on what students, teachers and principals think, how they feel, or how they perceive some concepts, and the importance of metaphors have been emphasized in this respect (Yıldızlı, Acar Erdol, Baştuğ, & Bayram, 2018).

Aristotle claimed that the words we use in our daily lives carry the meanings that we already know, but using metaphors is the best way to get something new (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015). As a force that affects our way of thinking (Berliner, 1990), metaphors start by concrete examples, and make abstract concepts more meaningful (Clarke, 1997; Morgan, 1998). In Turkish, metaphor is using a concept with a meaning other than its own meaning (Turkish Language Society [TDK], 2018). There are three elements in metaphors, which are "tenor", "vehicle" and "the features of the vehicle" (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2005). For example, when we say "teachers are like candles", the qualities of a candle are consciously attributed to the teacher. In the example, teacher (tenor) is resembled to a candle (vehicle), and the lighting feature of the candle (the feature of the vehicle) are used. Metaphors are figurative words that help existing hidden meanings reveal in individuals' minds (Doğan, 2014). People might not be aware that they use metaphors in their work, school or daily lives. In this respect, metaphors have a shaping effect consciously or unconsciously as part of the language in mental life (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015) and daily life (Mould, Oades, & Crowe, 2010) of an individual's language, science and daily life (Morgan, 1998). Metaphors that individuals use by reasoning (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015) transfer their lives and inner worlds (Levitt, Korman, & Angus, 2000). Metaphors do not only transfer a feeling and knowledge conceptually, but also create new meanings and explain assumptions (Fennell, 1996) by providing the transfer to be lively and eligible (Levitt, Korman, & Angus, 2000). Regardless of the concepts metaphors are used for, they take the concept from one place to another. Understanding a concept effectively depends on the efficiency of the metaphor used (Yob, 2003). According to Shuell (1990), metaphors are far more efficient than pictures: "If a picture is worth 1,000 words, a metaphor is worth 1,000 pictures! For a picture provides only a static image while a metaphor provides a conceptual framework for thinking about something."

Metaphoric expressions give strong clues especially about children's perceptions about themselves, important events in their lives, their views about life, and their communication with other people (Kararmak, 2015). Children are very willing to have new experiences and collect new information (Crowley & Mills, 1986). In the process of learning, children do not use ordinary patterns by enriching their information processing systems through the use of metaphors (Otto, 2000). According to Blenkiron (2005), metaphors transmit messages through concrete ways by becoming meaningful pieces in mind, and through metaphors children try to integrate their inner world with the outer world (Kararmak, 2015).

Metaphors reveal the perceptions of children. The use of metaphors in education provides children to expand and improve their views and understandings, and help them to understand all school processes with the help of meaning transfer (Bredeson, 1988). Researchers often conducted studies using metaphor analysis

in order to understand feelings and thoughts of schoolchildren related to a concept, event, situation, phenomenon or a creature. Jensen (2006) confirmed that there are 1129 studies where metaphors were used in ERIC (Educational Resource Information Center) database. Moreover, for this research, the examination of “metaphor” keyword in ERIC (2018) database revealed that there were 6225 metaphor studies available. For instance, student, teacher, principal and school (Inbar, 1996), leadership (Hernández-Amorós & Martínez Ruiz, 2018), pictures (Poveda et al., 2018), academic self (Bozlk, 2002), teacher (Nikitina & Furuoka, 2008), career (Creed & McIlveen, 2018), leadership and power (Fennell, 1996), teaching and learning process (Martinez, Sauleda, & Huber, 2001), energy in science (Daane et al., 2018), academic writing (Everett, 2018), values and behaviors of school administrators (Bredeson, 1988), professional identity (Zhu & Zhu, 2018), teacher evaluation (Derrington, 2013) and leadership (Schechter et al., 2018) were the concepts studied. Metaphor studies are not only conducted in education but also in other fields. For example, in psychology it was used in the treatment of children who wet their beds (Crowley & Mills, 1986). Collecting data through metaphor studies in Turkey started at the second half of 1990’s (Balci, 2011). When studies conducted in Turkey were reviewed; education and university (Bozkurt & Turan, 2017), classroom (Saritaş & Çelik, 2013), classroom management (Selçuk & Ataç, 2017), teacher (Akkaya, Özdemir, Akbulut, & Çıvgın, 2017; Başaran Uğur, & Baysal, 2017; Bircan, 2018; Cerit, 2008; Çelikten, 2006; Ekiz & Koçyiğit, 2013; Eminoğlu-Küçüktepe & Gürültü, 2014; Işık & Erdoğan, 2017; Kalyoncu, 2012; Kırıl, 2015; Ogurlu, Öpengin, & Hızlı, 2015; Saban, 2004), principal (Akan, Yalçın, & Yıldırım, 2014; Akkaya, Özdemir, Akbulut, & Çıvgın, 2017; Cerit, 2008; Dönmez, 2008; Korkmaz & Çevik, 2018; Yalçın & Erginer, 2012), inspector (Töremen & Döş, 2009), school (Akkaya, Özdemir, Akbulut, & Çıvgın, 2017; Balci, 2011; Cerit, 2006; Doğan, 2014; Koçak, 2013; Nalçacı & Bektaş, 2012; Ogurlu, Öpengin, & Hızlı, 2015; Özdemir, 2012; Toker, Gökçe, & Bülbül, 2014; Saban, 2008), language class (İnceçay, 2015), democracy (Susar Kırmızı & Tarhan, 2017), organization (Yılmaz & Polat, 2012), education (Altun & Apaydın, 2013), technology (Gök & Erdoğan, 2010), values education (Yazar, Özekici, & Lala, 2017), school culture (Özan & Demir, 2011), education faculty (Konaklı & Göğüş, 2013), post graduate education (Bektaş & Pehlivan, 2018), social web (Aktay, 2017), akhism (ahi) values (Şahin & Demirbaş, 2017), geography (Aydın & Eser Ünalı, 2010), nature (Deniş Çeliker & Akar, 2015), Turkish (Aydın, 2011; Pilav & Elkatmış, 2013), story map (Özdemir & Beyhatın, 2017), university lecturer (Tortop, 2013), and child picture (Uysal & Çakır Uysal, 2017) were the concepts studied through metaphors. Common aim in these studies was to gather information about individuals’ mental models.

When an individual expresses him/herself through metaphors, his/her expression is strengthened (Yıldızlı, Acar Erdol, Baştuğ, & Bayram, 2018) because metaphors are a tool, which makes it easier for people to tell their feelings and thoughts; in other words, it is a tool which helps them express their inner and outer worlds using different analogies (Cerit, 2008). In this respect, metaphors have natural duties such as making teachers’ and students’ work easier, providing concentration for students, and helping students gain new meanings (Açıkgöz, 2002). For example, teachers who want to improve quality of education in the class can use metaphors when they want to learn what is happening, and thus change and improve things (Çelik, 2016).

Expressing a thought using metaphors affects the listeners, drags them into the topic or event being told, and helps them think and feel like the teller. The more abstract the language used in telling is, the more complicated and incomprehensible becomes the feeling or thought to be expressed. If the expressed feeling or thought is made simple, understandable and concrete, the listener could understand the speaker better. The language used by someone expressing him/herself reveals his/her subconscious. Thus, understanding metaphors is a precious treasure in order to understand feelings and thoughts. By helping to transfer the meaning to outer world, metaphors explain the perceptions of children through a concept, a person or an object. When the relevant literature and studies investigated are taken into consideration, it could be suggested that metaphors are used to recognize, understand and explore the work, school or daily lives of individuals. The use of metaphors in education to explore, understand and reveal students’ inner and outer worlds, their

real feelings and thoughts could help to improve their education lives, and provide clues and evidence to overcome negative situations. In other words, analyzing the students' metaphorical perceptions about the concepts of school, teacher and principal could help us understand their school lives, give clues about defective sides of teaching-learning, and contribute to improve the quality of education. To sum up, as positive feelings and thoughts related to school, teacher and principal improve students' attachment to school cognitively, affectively and behaviorally (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Jimerson, Campos, & Greif, 2003), and as school attachment is related to academic success (Cornell, Shukla, & Konold, 2016; Griffin, 2014), school attendance (Wang, Willett, & Eccles, 2011), motivation (Hill & Werner, 2006), depression and school burnout (Wang, Chow, Hofkens, & Salmela-Aro, 2015), attitude towards lesson (Filiz, 2018), school climate (Özgenel, Çalışkan Yılmaz, & Baydar, 2018) and life satisfaction (Özdemir & Koruklu, 2013), having a few studies investigating the perceptions of especially third and fourth grade students related to school, teacher and principal metaphorically was considered important in terms of education and, a need for such a study arose. Since metaphors are used as a tool in understanding complex and abstract ideas (Linn, Sherman, & Gill, 2007), revealing the perceptions of students related to school, teacher and principal with the help of metaphors could provide important information and clues to the field, teachers, principals, guiding services, researchers and practitioners in terms of operation and management of school, academic success, attachment to school and teacher, and school climate etc. This information could help to understand perceptions and mental models of students related to school, teacher and principal. At this point, the aim of this study was to reveal, with the help of metaphors, how third and fourth grade primary school students perceive school, teacher and the principal. In this respect, following research questions were asked:

1. What are the metaphors produced by primary school students related to school, teacher and principal?
2. Do the metaphors related to school, teacher and principal produced by female and male students differ?
3. Do the metaphors related to school, teacher and principal produced by third and fourth grade students differ?

Method

Research Model

In this study, in order to determine the metaphors used by third and fourth grade students related to the concepts of principal, school and teacher, phenomenological research design of qualitative research models was used. Phenomenological research design focuses on phenomena, which are known but not understood; thus, no detailed information could be acquired. Phenomena can appear as perceptions, experiences, tendencies, conditions, and concepts (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011).

Study Group

The study group consisted of 197 students (99 females and 98 males) studying at two state schools in Kadikoy District at Anatolian Side of Istanbul. Study group was determined using convenient sampling. This method is a sampling type, which does not depend on possibilities but depends on availability and willingness of participants (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister, & Zechmeister, 2016). Frequencies and percentages related to demographic features of participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Features of Participants

Variables	n	%
Class	Third Grade	109
	Fourth Grade	88
		55,3
		44,7

Gender	Female	99	50,3
	Male	98	49,7
Total		197	100,0

According to Table 1, 50.3% of 197 students were females, 49.7% were males. 55.3% of the students attended third grade, and 44.7% of them attended fourth grade.

Data Collection Tool

After telling the aim and making necessary explanations, students were asked to fill in the blanks in the expressions “school resembles to ... because ...”, “teacher resembles to ... because”, and “Principal resembles to ... because ...”, and they were asked to find logical reasons for the resemblance they make. Such semi-structured sentences were used to as a data collection tool in similar studies (Inbar, 1996; Ogurlu, Öpengin, & Hızlı, 2015; Saban, 2004, 2008). Students were asked to express what they thought about the given concepts, and to explain them in a “because” sentence. Moreover, information concerning gender and class was also gathered.

Data Analysis

Metaphorical analysis is a type of analysis, which classifies and categorizes metaphors in terms of their similarities in order to collect data on individuals’ mental structures and inner worlds. In this study, content analysis technique was applied in the analysis of metaphors. According to content analysis, similar data are brought together with determined concepts and themes, and are interpreted (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012). In the study, forms of 208 students were analyzed, and 11 of these forms were excluded because of insufficient information. The analysis process regarding the forms of 197 students was held in three stages.

a) Application stage

The forms were prepared in accordance with the literature, explained to students with examples, and students were asked to fill in the blanks thinking what the words in the form meant. Students were not directed, and there were no time constraints.

b) Compilation of metaphors stage

After the forms were filled in, all the metaphors were compiled by coding them in terms of gender and class variables. While determining the numbers of the metaphors, Microsoft Excel Office program was used to sort out same, similar and different metaphors.

c) Conceptual category development stage

At this stage, metaphors related to school, teacher and principal were grouped in terms of their common features. While grouping, explanations after the word “because” were considered. At first, there were many categories, then overlapping metaphors were brought together, and three categories each for school and teacher, and five categories for principal were determined. At this stage, all the metaphors were placed in a category.

In order to ensure the validity of the results, each and every stage of category forming process was explained in detail, and all the metaphors were provided in the “findings” section. In order to achieve reliability, expert opinion was asked to see if the metaphors produced by students and the emerging categories fit. Frequencies and percentages related to metaphors produced by students and emerging categories were calculated, and a chi-square test was applied in order to determine whether the categories differed in terms of gender and class levels.

Results

The metaphorical analysis results related to school, principal and teachers were given under different titles. Each title consisted of metaphors, categories emerged from the metaphors, and chi-square analysis results concerning whether the categories differed in terms of gender and class levels.

School-Related Metaphors

Metaphors the participants produced in terms of school concept are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. School-related metaphors of students

Metaphor	n	%	School		
			Metaphor	n	%
Home	96	48,7	Life	1	,5
Cradle of Knowledge	19	9,6	Torture	1	,5
Library	17	8,6	Good	1	,5
Family	9	4,6	Enjoyable	1	,5
Education	9	4,6	Mansion	1	,5
Fun	9	4,6	Rules	1	,5
Beautiful	8	4,1	Friend	1	,5
Factory	5	2,5	Happiness	1	,5
World	3	1,5	Game	1	,5
Teaching	3	1,5	A special place	1	,5
Bank	2	1,0	Park	1	,5
Building	2	1,0	Dream	1	,5
Book	2	1,0	Love	1	,5
			Total	197	100,0

When Table 2 was considered, it was seen that students produced 26 metaphors related to school. Almost all the metaphors were positive except for one metaphor “torture” produced by a student. Almost half of the students (48.7%) produced “home” metaphor for school. Other than this, metaphors such as cradle of knowledge (9.6%), library (8.6%), family (4.6%), education (4.6%), fun (4.6%), beautiful (4.1%), factory (2.5%) were produced frequently.

Classification of school-related metaphors produced by students is presented in categories in Table 3.

Table 3. Classification of school-related metaphors in categories

Category	n	%	Metaphors
Protecting Place	106	53,8	Home, Family, Mansion
Educating Place	65	33,0	Cradle of Knowledge, Library, Education, Teaching, Factory, World, Book, Life, Bank, Building, World, Factory, Life
Love and Fun Place	26	13,2	Beautiful, Fun, Love, Park, Dream, Friend, Good, Enjoyable

When Table 3 was examined, the metaphors produced by students related to school appeared to fall in three categories as “protecting place”, “educating place” and “love and fun place”. The percentage for protecting place was 53.8, and it was consisted of home, family and mansion metaphors. The percentage for educating place category was 33, and the highest number of metaphors was in this category. Some of these metaphors were cradle of knowledge, library, education, and teaching. Love and fun category, on the other hand, had 13.2% of the metaphors. Metaphors placed under this category were beautiful, fun, love, park, dream, friend, good, and enjoyable.

Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphors produced by students related to school differed according to gender are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphor categories produced by students related to school differed according to gender

Variable	School			Total		
	Protecting Place	Educating Place	Love and Fun Place			
Gender	Female	n	54	32	13	99
		%	54,5	32,3	13,1	100,0
	Male	n	52	33	13	98
		%	53,1	33,7	13,3	100,0
Total	n	106	65	26	197	
	%	53,8	33,0	13,2	100,0	

$\chi^2=.048$, Sd.2, $p=.976$

When Table 4 was considered, it was found that categories derived from the metaphors produced by students did not differ according to gender ($\chi^2=.048$, Sd=2, $p=.976$). In other words, categories derived from students' metaphors did not differ according to female and male students.

Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphors produced by students related to school differed according to classroom levels are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphor categories produced by students related to school differed according to classroom levels.

Variable	School			Total		
	Protecting Place	Educating Place	Love and Fun Place			
Class	Third Grade	n	59	27	23	109
		%	54,1	24,8	21,1	100,0
	Fourth Grade	n	47	38	3	88
		%	53,4	43,2	3,4	100,0
Total	n	106	65	26	197	
	%	53,8	33,0	13,2	100,0	

$\chi^2=16.554$, Sd.2, $p=.000$

According to chi-square results presented in Table 5, there was a significant difference between third and fourth grade students in terms of category distributions ($\chi^2=16.554$, Sd=2, $p=.000$). When the percentage distributions were investigated, it was observed that the percentage distribution was similar for both groups in "protecting place" category; however, fourth graders in "educating place" category, and third graders in "love and fun place" category had higher percentages.

Teacher-Related Metaphors

Metaphors students produced in terms of "teacher" concept are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Teacher-related metaphors of students

Metaphor	Teacher		Metaphor	N	%
	n	%			
Family	98	49,7	Girl	2	1,0
Knowledge	20	10,2	Boss	2	1,0
Sun	12	6,1	Princess	2	1,0
Education	10	5,1	Learning	2	1,0
Angel	10	5,1	Computer	1	,5
Love	8	4,1	Mind	1	,5

Teaches	4	2,0	Bee	1	,5
Beautiful	3	1,5	Mirror	1	,5
Interested	3	1,5	Captain	1	,5
Book	3	1,5	Ant	1	,5
Star	3	1,5	Leader	1	,5
Flower	2	1,0	Professor	1	,5
Home	2	1,0	Caring	1	,5
Good	2	1,0	Total	197	100,0

As seen in Table 6, students produced 27 metaphors concerning teachers. The students did not use any negative metaphors related to teachers. Almost half of the students (49.7%) used “family” metaphor for teachers. Together with this, the most common metaphors concerning teacher were knowledge (10.2%), sun (6.1%), education (5.1%), angel (5.1%), love (4.1%), and teaches (2%).

Metaphor categories students produced related to teachers are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Classification of teacher metaphors in categories

Category	n	%	Metaphor
Protecting	107	55,4	Family, home, caring, captain, leader, boss
Educating	55	28,5	Knowledge, education, teaches, sun, book, star, professor
Loving	31	16,1	Angel, love, beautiful, good, flower, caring, princess

When Table 7 was examined, the metaphors fell under three categories. “Protecting” category had a percentage of 55.4, and consisted of family, home, caring, captain, leader, and boss metaphors. The percentage for “educating” category was 28.5, and the metaphors in this category were knowledge, education, teaches, sun, book, star, and professor. “Loving” category had a percentage of 16.1, and consisted of angel, love, beautiful, good, flower, caring, and princess. These results revealed that protecting feature of the teacher was in the foreground.

Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphors produced by students related to teachers differed according to gender are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphor categories produced by students related to teachers differed according to gender

Variable	Teacher			Total		
	Protecting	Educating	Loving			
Gender	Female	n	58	25	15	98
		%	59,2	25,5	15,3	100,0
	Male	n	49	30	16	95
		%	51,6	31,6	16,8	100,0
Total	n	107	55	31	193	
	%	55,4	28,5	16,1	100,0	

$\chi^2=1.197, Sd=2, p=.550$

Chi-square analysis results revealed that there was not a significant difference between female and male students in terms of category distributions ($\chi^2=1.197, Sd=2, p=.550$). According to this result, there was no relation between genders in terms of metaphors produced for teachers.

Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphors produced by students related to teachers differed according to classroom levels are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphor categories produced by students related to teachers differed according to classroom levels

Variable	Teacher			Total		
	Protecting	Educating	Loving			
Class	Third Grade	n	58	19	29	106
		%	54,7	17,9	27,4	100,0
	Fourth Grade	n	49	36	2	87
		%	56,3	41,4	2,3	100,0
Total		n	107	55	31	193
		%	55,4	28,5	16,1	100,0

$\chi^2=27.928$, Sd=2, p=.000

According to the chi-square analysis presented in Table 9, there was a significant difference between third and fourth grade students in terms of category distributions ($\chi^2=27.928$, Sd=2, p=.000). When the distribution of percentages were examined in order to find out the sources of this difference, it was seen that distribution of percentage for “protecting” category for both groups was similar; however, fourth graders in “educating” category and third graders in “loving” category had higher percentages.

School Principal-Related Metaphors

Metaphors students produced in terms of “principal” concept are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Principal-related metaphors of students

Metaphors			Principal		
	n	%	Metaphors	n	%
Leader	47	23,9	Education	2	1,0
Director	35	17,8	Male	2	1,0
Family	33	16,8	Angry	2	1,0
Teacher	10	5,1	Commander	1	,5
Hardworking	12	6,1	Tolerance	1	,5
Love	8	4,1	President	1	,5
Rule	7	3,6	Architect	1	,5
Good	6	3,0	School	1	,5
			Representative		
Knowledge	5	2,5	Owner	1	,5
Representative	5	2,5	Sweet	1	,5
My grandfather	4	2,0	Helping	1	,5
Strong	3	1,5	Manager	1	,5
Caring	3	1,5	Man	1	,5
Management	3	1,5	Toplam	197	100,0

As seen in Table 10, students produced 27 metaphors related to school principal. Although almost all the metaphors students produced related to the principal were positive, only two students used “angry” as a metaphor (See Table 10). The most frequent metaphors related to principal were leader (23.9%), director (17.8%), family (16.8%), hardworking (6.1%), and teacher (5.1%).

Classification of metaphors students produced related to “principal” concept in categories is presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Classification of “principal” metaphors in categories

Categories	n	%	Metaphors
Leading	78	39.6	Leader, Teacher, Knowledge, Hardworking, Education, Architect, Helping
Directing	45	22.8	Manages, Director, Management, Male, Strong, Angry, Commander
Protecting	38	19.3	Family, My Grandfather, Owner
Source of Power	17	8.6	Man, President, Rule, School Representative, Representative
Source of Love	19	9.6	Tolerance, Good, Love, Caring, Sweet

As seen in Table 11, metaphors produced by students fell into five categories as leading, directing, protecting, source of power, and source of love. In Table 11, seven metaphors were placed under leading category. This category covered 39.6% of all metaphors. Similarly, seven metaphors were placed under directing category, and it covered 22.8% of all metaphors. Even though there were three metaphors in protecting category, it covered 19.3% of all metaphors. There were five metaphors in each of the source of power and source of love categories.

Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphors produced by students related to principals differed according to gender are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphors produced by students related to principals differed according to gender

Variable		Categories					Total	
		Leading	Directing	Protecting	Source of Power	Source of Love		
Gender	Female	n	40	22	18	10	9	99
		%	40,4	22,2	18,2	10,1	9,1	100,0
	Male	n	38	23	20	7	10	98
		%	38,8	23,5	20,4	7,1	10,2	100,0
Total	n	78	45	38	17	19	197	
	%	39,6	22,8	19,3	8,6	9,6	100,0%	

$\chi^2=.756$, Sd=4, p=.944

According to chi-square analysis results in Table 12, there was no difference between female and male students in terms of category distributions ($\chi^2=.756$, Sd=4, p=.944). This result revealed that there was no relation between gender and principal-related metaphors.

Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphors produced by students related to principals differed according to classroom levels are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Chi-square analysis results concerning whether the metaphors produced by students related to principals differed according to classroom levels

Variables		Categories					Total	
		Leading	Directing	Protecting	Source of Power	Source of Love		
Class	Third Grade	n	36	19	29	12	13	109
		%	33,0	17,4	26,6	11,0	11,9	100,0
	Fourth Grade	n	42	26	9	5	6	88
		%	47,7	29,5	10,2	5,7	6,8	100,0
Total	n	78	45	38	17	19	197	
	%	39,6	22,8	19,3	8,6	9,6	100,0	

$\chi^2=15.475$, Sd=4, p=.004

According to chi-square analysis results presented in Table 13, there was a difference between third and fourth grade students in terms of category distributions ($\chi^2=15.475$, Sd=4, p=.004). When the distribution of percentages was examined to find out the source of the difference, it was revealed that fourth grade students

mostly preferred to use metaphors placed in “leading” and “directing” categories, whereas third grade students preferred to use metaphors in “protecting”, “source of power” and “source of love” categories.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

In this study, students were asked to produce metaphors related to school, teacher and principal concepts, the produced metaphors were analyzed, and findings were discussed in this part. Participating students produced 26 metaphors related to school. The most common metaphors students produced were house, cradle of knowledge, library, family, education, and fun. Since students experienced the warmth of a family and interest at school, they might have used home and family metaphors the most. Although almost all the metaphors were positive, only one student produced “torture” metaphor. Metaphors of students related to school were gathered under three categories as “protecting place”, “educating place” and “love and fun place”. In other words, school is not only a building for students, but it is also a protecting, educating, full of love and fun place because it provides the interest and love they have back at home. According to chi-square analysis results, no difference in terms of categories between female and male students was detected. According to this result, metaphor categories related to school concept did not differ according to gender of students. However, there was a difference between third and fourth grade students in terms of metaphor category distributions related to school. It was observed that the distribution of percentages were similar in both groups for “protecting place”; however, fourth grade students in “educating place” and third grade students in “love and fun place” categories had higher percentages. This result revealed that in the perceptions of students regarding the school, the concept of school as a place of fun changed into a place of education from third grade to fourth grade. It is also fair to claim that the results of this study are consistent with studies in the relevant literature. According to a study by Cerit (2006), fifth grade students’ metaphorical perceptions concerning school concept did not differ in terms of gender, but students completely internalized that “school is a place of knowledge and enlightenment”. Saban (2008) found in their study that primary school students produced “home, center of knowledge, nest, family, book, flower, sun, mother, teacher” metaphors related to school. In the same study, it was also revealed that third grade students produced more metaphors in “love and cooperation place” category, fourth grade students in “knowledge and enlightenment place”, and fifth grade students in “growing and maturation place” categories. In a study by Tolunay Ateş (2016), fourth and eighth grade students produced “home, prison, nest, cradle of knowledge, life and family” metaphors related to school. While fourth grade students produced higher number of metaphors in “love and trust environment” category, eighth grade students produced more metaphors in “loveless and punishment place” category. In another study, students expressed that school is a place which provides teaching and learning function, and in which people are safe (Gök, 2017). Metaphors produced by gifted students are gathered in “a protective environment which is relaxing” category (Ogurlu, Öpengin, & Hızlı, 2015). Sixth, seventh and eighth grade students perceive school as a place where information is provided, which is protecting and safe, and where new generations are educated. Moreover, it was also observed that students consider school as a place, which is highly disciplined (Aydoğdu, 2008). Balcı (1999) identified that the perceptions of primary school students are more positive about school when compared to secondary school students. Similarly, the study conducted by Özdemir (2012) on high school students revealed that school perceptions of students lower as classroom levels increase; female students perceive school as a “protecting, growing place and home” while male students perceive school as a “suppression” place. One of the most important findings of Inbar’s (1996) study was that the school is resembled to “an education prison free of charge”. When all the results are evaluated as a whole, it can be claimed that a lot of metaphors and categories are produced to explain school concept, the perceptions of students related to school are mostly positive, but this positive perception lowers as classroom levels increase.

As for another finding of the study, students produced 27 metaphors related to teacher concept. The most common metaphors were family, knowledge, sun, education, angel, and love. The metaphors produced by the students were collected under three categories as protecting, educating and loving. The reason of these metaphors could be that students spent many hours together with their teacher. It could also be claimed that the metaphors students produced could be related to behaviors of teachers in the classroom. For example, for the teachers who prefer democratic and constructive tendencies, metaphors of team player, guide and director are used in the literature (Ocak & Gündüz, 2006; De Guerrero & Villamil, 2001; Zapata & Lacorte, 2007). Moreover, it is interesting that teachers remind students of family, and at the same time students consider teachers as full of knowledge, sun and angel. These metaphors can be considered as an indicator of love, trust and peace students feel against teachers. Similarly, in a study conducted by Turhan and Yaraş (2013), primary school students used angel, mother-father, flower, sun, and book metaphors for teachers the most, and they considered teachers as illuminating, trustable and protecting. Chi-square analysis results of this study revealed that there were no significant differences between female and male students in terms of category distributions related to teacher concept. In other words, metaphor categories produced by students did not differ according to the genders of students. On the other hand, metaphor categories produced by students differed in terms of classroom levels. According to chi-square percentage distributions, the distributions were similar in both groups in “protecting” category; in addition to this, it was also seen that fourth grade students in “educating” category and third grade students in “loving” category had higher percentages. In other words, perceptions of third grade students related to teacher differed when compared to fourth grade students. While “love” is in the foreground for third grade students, “education” is in the foreground for fourth grade students. Balcı (1999) determined that perceptions of primary school students related to teacher are more positive when compared to secondary school students. In Cerit’s (2008) study, primary school students considered “source and distributor of knowledge, mother-father, friend, guide and the person who illuminates” metaphors related to teacher important. Tolunay Ateş (2016) called attention to how high was the percentage for “informative and substantial” category (36%). In this study, students resembled teachers to family, angel, love, light and energy sources, and perceived them as source of knowledge, protecting and educating person. Similarly, there are studies in the literature, which investigate perceptions of students related to teachers in various school types and various classroom levels. For example, from “mother-father, angel, flower, sun, candle, book” metaphors produced by fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth grade students, “source of knowledge, protecting and loving, source of life” categories emerged (Egüz & Öntaş, 2018). In their study, Başaran, Uğur and Baysal (2017) determined that while describing English teachers, students used “washing machine, internet, smart phone and laser” metaphors together with “mother, father, book, tree, guide, brain, and sun” metaphors. Most common metaphors produced by gifted students related to their teachers were in “protecting and supporting person” category (Ogurlu, Öpengin, & Hızlı, 2015). Pre-service teachers in university resembled teaching profession to parents, gardener (Ocak & Gündüz, 2006; Saban, Koçbeker & Saban, 2006), sun (Ocak & Gündüz, 2006; Ekiz & Koçyiğit, 2013; Saban, Koçbeker & Saban, 2006; Turhan & Yaraş, 2013), sculptor, compass, lighthouse, candle, tree, painter, and tourist guide (Saban, Koçbeker & Saban, 2006). Similarly, from the metaphors that pre-service teachers produced for teaching profession “source of knowledge, directing and guiding, growing and improving (Ekici, Baş, & Kızılkaya, 2017; Ekiz & Koçyiğit, 2013)” categories emerged. Moreover, from the metaphors which students from different cultures and different education levels produced; film director, lion tamer (De Guerrero & Villamil, 2000), provider information (De Guerrero & Villamil, 2001; De Guerrero & Villamil, 2002; Nikitina, & Furuoka, 2008; Zapata & Lacorte, 2007), partner, challenger, change agent, innovator, artist, fixer (De Guerrero & Villamil, 2001; De Guerrero & Villamil, 2002), gate keeper (Zapata & Lacorte, 2007), producer, opponent, entertainer, and learning partner (Oxford et al., 1998) categories emerged. It could be claimed that the metaphors produced by primary school students related to teacher concept in this study have similar results with the studies conducted at primary school level in the literature, but the results are partly compatible with the results of

studies held at various school levels, various grades, and different cultures. There might be a variety of reasons for this. One reason might be that educational needs and expectations from teachers of primary and secondary, high school and university students are different. A second reason might be that whereas primary school students interact with only a couple of teachers, secondary school, high school and university students interact and communicate with many teachers in their educational lives. A final reason is that the prestige, image and cultural role of teaching profession may differ in different cultures.

According to the results of the third and the final sub aim of the study, students expressed the principal concept with 27 metaphors. The most common metaphors related to principals were leader, director, family, hardworking, and teacher. The principal metaphors of students were gathered in five categories as guiding, directing, protecting, source of power, and source of love. School principals are people who try to apply regulations, and who are decision makers. In this respect, students perceive principals positively as guiding, directing, protecting, a source of power, and a source of love. According to chi-square analysis conducted in order to determine whether categories formed for metaphors related to principals differed in terms of classroom levels and genders of students, there were no significant differences between female and male students in terms of category distributions. However, there was a significant difference for the distributions of metaphor categories between third and fourth grade students. Accordingly, while fourth grade students' principal-related metaphors were mostly in "guiding" and "directing" categories, third grade students' principal-related metaphors were mostly in "protecting", "source of power" and "source of love" categories. The results of this study are similar with the results of a study which was conducted by Turhan and Yaraş (2013). According to Turhan and Yaraş (2013), primary school students indicated that they perceived principals as trustworthy, leader, hardworking and knowledgeable, controller, organizer, and guiding. The "father" metaphor, which was not detected in this study, was the most common metaphor in Turhan and Yavaş's study. Tüzel and Şahin (2014) found out that primary school students perceived principals mostly as "directing", "guiding" and "protecting" people. Aydoğdu (2008), on the other hand, indicated that secondary school students described principals using "mother-father" metaphor, and produced most metaphors in "protecting and trustworthy" category. Yalçın and Erginer (2012) pinpointed that secondary school students mostly produced "father, lion, angel, head of the family, ant, locomotive, a bag of nerves, mother-father, maestro and flower" metaphors related to principals, and these metaphors fell under "protecting, guiding and directing person" categories. Similar results were also encountered in studies conducted in different cultures. For example, it was observed that "leader", "power", "volcano" and "maestro" are common metaphors used (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003; Fennel, 1996; Inbar, 1996; Monroe, 2003). According to the results of studies, students characterized principals as people who protect them, work to create an environment of trust, direct and guide; thus, they perceived principals positively. Moreover, it was also observed that the directing and leading roles of principals were in forefront, and they were perceived as guides. Studies held in different cultures revealed that adjectives and metaphors associated with leadership like "power" and "volcano" are used for principals (Fennel, 1996; Inbar, 1996). Inbar (1996) indicated that principals are invincible and strong, and students use "boss", "king" and "warrior" metaphors for them. However, there are also some studies in which principals are perceived negatively. For example, perceptions of primary school students are more positive compared to the perceptions of secondary school students (Balci, 1999). Similarly, Yıldırım and Uğur (2011) reported that primary school students mostly have negative perceptions related to principals. Tüzel and Şahin (2014) ascertained that primary school students produced fewer metaphors concerning the "problem solving" and "fixing" duties of principals. In the same study, student drawings were examined and it was revealed that primary school students depicted negative behaviors related to principals like "beating, violence and scolding". Moreover, most secondary school students perceive principals as rude, disciplined, harming and authoritarian (Aydoğdu, 2008; Balci, 1999). It was determined in studies conducted by Inbar (1996) and Lum (1997) that principals are authoritarian people. According to the results of the studies, students perceive

principals both positively as protecting, guiding and directing leaders, and negatively as rude, disciplined and authoritarian managers. Briggs (2005), Wood (2005) and Loder and Spillane (2005) claimed that being a leader is among the most important duties of principals. Moreover, principals' acts affect students as a shareholder of school directly, and shape their perceptions of a principal. In this respect, the necessity and importance for principals to be the leader in their schools is clearly obvious. Since how students perceive principals is considered more important than how they actually are as person (Linn, Sherman, & Gill, 2007), why principals are considered negatively could be investigated by various studies. As educational needs and expectations of students differ in accordance with the school type and classroom levels, their expectations of a principal also differ. As a matter of fact, a principal who has an outstanding success and apply effective leadership at one high school may not show the same success in another high school, primary school or secondary school. Thus, principals could determine student needs and expectations by keeping the developmental features of students in accordance with the school structure, find out how students perceive them, and regulate his applications accordingly.

Consequently, according to the results of this study, students mostly consider school as home and nest, see their teachers as a family and a source of knowledge, and perceive principals as a leader and a director. Students who internalize the school as home and nest naturally consider teachers as family. The way the students perceive school as their own home, their teachers as a second family after their own family, school principals as a leader and a director could be accepted as positive, and considered in teaching-learning processes at school and in class. Moreover, when all the metaphor categories were evaluated as a whole, it was observed that most of the students produced positive, concrete and non-living metaphors related to "school" concept; positive, concrete and living metaphors for "teacher" and "principal" concepts; and school, teacher and principal had important places in children's educational lives.

Metaphors both reveal the ideas of people and shape their perceptions of reality. Thus, metaphors emerged as a result of this study are important in terms of revealing the perceptions of students related to principals, teachers and school, and making evaluations and applications accordingly. Moreover, it should not be ignored that the perceptions of students related to teachers, principals and school have important contributions in their commitment to school and their school success. There are both similarities and disputes between this study and other studies in the literature. In this respect, metaphorical studies conducted in education field so far and the ones to be conducted in the future could contribute to similar studies.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

İlkokul Öğrencilerinin “Okul, Öğretmen ve Müdür” Kavramlarına İlişkin Algılarının Metaforik Analizi

Giriş

Metaforlar, anlamın dış dünyaya aktarılmasını sağlayarak, çocukların bir kavrama, bir kişiye veya bir nesneye yönelik algılarını, davranışlarını, duygularını, değerlerini ve düşüncelerini açıklar. Öğrencilerin, okul, öğretmen ve müdürlere yönelik algılarının metaforlar aracılığı ile ortaya çıkarılması okulun işleyişi ve yönetimi, akademik başarı, okula ve öğretmene bağlılık, okul iklimi gibi konularda alana, öğretmenlere, müdürlere, rehberlik servislerine, araştırmacılara ve uygulayıcılara önemli bilgiler veya ipuçları sunabilir. Bu bilgiler öğrencilerin okul, müdür ve öğretmene ilişkin algılarının ve zihinsel modellerinin anlaşılmasına yardım edebilir.

Çalışmanın Amacı

Çalışmanın amacı, ilkokul 3. ve 4. sınıf öğrencilerin gözüyle, okul, okul müdürü ve öğretmen kavramlarını nasıl algılandıklarını metaforlar aracılığıyla ortaya çıkarmaktır.

Yöntem

Araştırmanın Modeli

Bu araştırmada, üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin müdür, okul ve öğretmen kavramlarına ilişkin metaforları belirleyebilmek için nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden olgu bilim deseni (fenomoloji) kullanılmıştır.

Çalışma Grubu

Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu 2017-2018 eğitim-öğretim yılında İstanbul ili Anadolu Yakası Kadıköy ilçesinde bulunan iki devlet okulunda 99'u kız 98'i erkek olmak üzere toplam 197 üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır.

Veri toplama aracı

Öğrencilere araştırmanın amacı ve gerekli açıklamalar yapıldıktan sonra “Okul ... benzer. Çünkü ..., Öğretmen ... benzer. Çünkü ..., ve Müdür ... benzer. Çünkü ...” ifadelerindeki boşlukları doldurmaları ve yapılan benzetmelerde öğrencilerin mantıksal bir sebep bulmaları istenmiştir. Öğrencilere verilen kavramlarla ilgili ne düşündüklerini bir metaforla dile getirmeleri “çünkü” ifadesiyle açıklamaları istenmiştir.

Verilerin analizi

Toplanan veriler içerik analizi ile analiz edilmiştir. Araştırmada 208 öğrenciye ait formlar analiz edilmiş ve 11 öğrenciye ait formlarda eksik bilgiler olduğu için değerlendirme kapsamı dışında tutulmuştur. Toplam 197 öğrenciye ait formların analiz süreci üç basamakta gerçekleşmiştir.

Bulgular

Öğrenciler, okulla ilgili 26 metafor üretmişlerdir. Metaforların tamamına yakını olumlu olup sadece bir öğrenci “işkençe” metaforunu üretmiştir. Öğrencilerin yaklaşık yarısı (%48.7) okul için ev metaforunu üretmişlerdir. Bunun dışında bilgi yuvası (%9.6), kütüphane (%8.6), aile (%4.6), eğitim (%4.6), eğlence (%4.6), güzel (%4.1), fabrika (2.5) sıklıkla üretilen metaforlar olmuştur. Öğrencilerin okula ilişkin ürettikleri metaforlar, “koruyan yer”, “eğiten yer” ile “sevgi ve eğlence yeri” olarak isimlendirilen üç kategori altında toplanmıştır. Öğrencilerin okula ilişkin ürettikleri metaforlardan ulaşılan kategoriler, öğrencilerin cinsiyetlerine göre anlamlı farklılık göstermediği tespit edilmiştir ($\chi^2=0.048$, $Sd=2$, $p=0.976$). Ki-kare analizi sonucuna göre üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrenciler arasında kategori dağılımları açısından fark vardır

($\chi^2=16.554$, $Sd=2$, $p=.000$). Farkın kaynağını tespit etmek amacıyla yüzde dağılımları incelendiğinde, “koruyan yer” kategorisinde yüzde dağılımın iki grupta da benzer olduğu, bununla birlikte “eğiten yer” kategorisinde dördüncü sınıfların, “sevgi ve eğlence yeri” kategorisinde ise üçüncü sınıfların daha yüksek orana sahip oldukları görülmektedir.

Öğrenciler, öğretmenlerle ilgili 27 tane metafor üretmişlerdir. Öğrencilerin öğretmenlere ilişkin olumsuz metaforu bulunmamaktadır. Öğrencilerin yaklaşık yarısı (%49.7) öğretmen için aile metaforunu kullanmıştır. Bunun dışında bilgi (%10.2), güneş (%6.1), eğitim (%5.1), melek (%5.1), sevgi (%4.1), öğretir (%2) sıklıkla üretilen metaforlar olmuştur. Metaforların 3 kategori altında toplandığı görülmektedir. Koruyan kategorisinin yüzdesi 55.4 olup aile, ev, ilgili, kaptan, lider, patron metaforlarından oluşmaktadır. Eğiten kategorisinin yüzdesi 28.5 olup, burada bulunan metaforlar; bilgi, eğitim, öğretir, güneş, kitap, yıldız, profesördür. Seven kategorisi ise yüzde 16.1 olup altında yer alan metaforlar, melek, sevgi, güzel, iyi, çiçek, şefkatli, prenestir. Bu sonuçlardan öğretmenin koruyan özelliğinin daha ön planda olduğu görülmektedir. Ki-kare analizi sonucuna göre, kız ve erkek öğrenciler arasında kategori dağılımları açısından fark yoktur ($\chi^2=1.197$, $Sd=2$, $p=.550$). Ki-kare analizi sonucuna göre, üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrenciler arasında kategori dağılımları açısından fark vardır ($\chi^2=27.928$, $Sd=2$, $p=.000$). Farkın kaynağını tespit etmek amacıyla yüzde dağılımları incelendiğinde, koruyan kategorisinde yüzde dağılımın iki grupta da benzer olduğu, bununla birlikte eğiten kategorisinde dördüncü sınıfların, seven kategorisinde ise üçüncü sınıfların daha yüksek orana sahip oldukları görülmektedir.

Öğrenciler, okul müdürlerine yönelik 27 adet metafor üretmişlerdir. Öğrencilerin, okul müdürlerine ilişkin ürettikleri metaforların tamamına yakını olumlu iken, sadece iki öğrenci olumsuz olarak “kızgın” metaforunu üretmişlerdir. Müdürler için üretilen metaforlardan en sık olanları lider (%23.9), yönetici (%17.8), aile (%16.8), çalışkan (%6.1) ve öğretmendir (%5.1). Öğrencilerin ürettikleri metaforlar yol gösteren, yöneten, koruyan, güç kaynağı ve sevgi kaynağı olarak beş kategoriye ayrılmıştır. Yol gösteren kategorisi altına yedi metafor yerleşmiştir. Bu kategorinin bütün içerisindeki yeri %39.6’dır. Yöneten kategorisi altına da yedi metafor yerleşmiş olup ağırlığı %22.8’dir. Koruyan kategorisinde üç metafor olmasına rağmen ağırlığı %19.3’tür. Güç kaynağı ve sevgi kaynağında beşer metafor bulunmaktadır. Ki-kare analizi sonucuna göre kız ve erkek öğrenciler arasında kategori dağılımları açısından fark yoktur ($\chi^2=.756$, $Sd=4$, $p=.944$). Ki-kare analizi sonucuna göre üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrenciler arasında kategori dağılımları açısından fark vardır ($\chi^2=15.475$, $Sd=4$, $p=.004$). Farkın kaynağını tespit etmek amacıyla yüzde dağılımları incelendiğinde, dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin daha çok “yol gösteren” ve “yöneten” kategorisinde bulunan metaforları, üçüncü sınıfların ise daha çok “koruyan”, “güç kaynağı” ve “sevgi kaynağı” metaforları kullandıkları görülmektedir.

Sonuç, Tartışma ve Öneriler

Araştırmaya katılan öğrenciler, okulla ilgili 26 metafor üretmişlerdir. Öğrencilerin en çok ürettikleri metaforlar ev, bilgi yuvası, kütüphane, aile, eğitim ve eğlencedir. Öğrencilerin okula ilişkin metaforları, “koruyan yer”, “eğiten yer” ile “sevgi ve eğlence yeri” olarak isimlendirilen üç kategori altında toplanmıştır. Yapılan ki-kare analizi sonucuna göre, kız ve erkek öğrenciler arasında kategori dağılımları açısından farklılık tespit edilmemiştir. Bununla birlikte, üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrenciler arasında okula ilişkin metafor kategori dağılımları açısından farklılık bulunmuştur. Bu sonuca göre, öğrencilerin okul algılarında üçüncü sınıftan dördüncü sınıfa doğru eğlence yerinden eğitim yerine doğru bir değişimin olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Araştırmanın diğer bir bulgusuna göre öğrenciler, öğretmen kavramına ilişkin 27 tane metafor üretmişlerdir. En çok üretilen metaforlar, aile, bilgi, güneş, eğitim, melek ve sevgidir. Öğrencilerle üretilen metaforlar koruyan, eğiten ve seven isimleriyle üç kategori altında toplanmıştır. Bu çalışmada yapılan ki-kare analizi sonucuna göre, kız ve erkek öğrenciler arasında öğretmen kavramına ilişkin kategori dağılımları açısından farklılık tespit edilmemiştir. Bunun yanında, öğrencilerin öğretmen kavramına yönelik ürettikleri metafor kategorileri sınıf seviyelerine göre farklılık göstermektedir. Başka bir ifadeyle üçüncü sınıftaki

öğrencilerin öğretmenlere ilişkin algıları dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerine göre farklılık göstermektedir. Öğrenciler için üçüncü sınıfta “sevgi” ön planda iken, dördüncü sınıfta “eğitim” ön plana çıkmaktadır.

Araştırmanın üçüncü ve son alt amacına ilişkin elde edilen bulguya göre öğrenciler, okul müdürü kavramını 27 metafor ile ifade etmişlerdir. Müdürler için üretilen metaforlardan en sık olanları lider, yönetici, aile, çalışkan ve öğretmendir. Öğrencilerin müdür metaforları yol gösteren, yöneten, koruyan, güç kaynağı ve sevgi kaynağı olarak beş kategoride toplanmıştır. Okul yöneticileri okullarda kural ve yönetmelikleri uygulamaya çalışan ve karar alıcı kişilerdir. Bu anlamda öğrenciler, okul içinde müdürleri yol gösteren, yöneten, koruyan, güç kaynağı ve sevgi kaynağı olarak olumlu algılamaktadır. Müdür metaforları için oluşturulan kategorilerin öğrencilerin cinsiyetlerine ve sınıf seviyelerine göre farklılaşp farklılaşmadığını test etmek için kullanılan ki-kare analizi sonucuna göre kız ve erkek öğrenciler arasında kategori dağılımları açısından anlamlı farklılık yoktur. Ancak, üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerin metafor kategorinin dağılımları arasında anlamlı bir fark vardır. Buna göre, dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin müdür metaforları daha çok “yol gösteren” ve “yöneten” kategorisinde iken, üçüncü sınıfların müdür metaforları daha çok “koruyan”, “güç kaynağı” ve “sevgi kaynağı” metaforları kategorisinde toplanmıştır.

Öğrencilerin eğitim ihtiyaçları ve eğitimden beklentileri, eğitim gördükleri okul türü ve sınıf seviyelerine göre farklılık göstermekle birlikte, yine okul müdürlerinden beklentileri de değişebilmektedir. Hatta bir lisede üstün başarı gösteren ve etkili liderlik uygulamalarına gerçekleştiren bir müdür, başka bir lise türüne, ilkokul veya ortaokul kademesinde görev yaptığında aynı başarıyı göstermeyebilir. Bu nedenle okul müdürleri görev yaptıkları okulun yapısına uygun bir şekilde öğrencilerin gelişim özelliklerini göz önünde bulundurarak öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarını ve beklentilerini tespit edebilir, öğrenciler tarafından nasıl algılandığını belirleyebilir ve buna uygun uygulamalarda bulunabilir.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmanın bulgularına göre öğrenciler çoğunlukla okulu ev ve yuva olarak kabul etmekte, öğretmenlerini aile ve bilgi kaynağı olarak görmekte ve okul müdürlerini lider ve yönetici olarak algılamaktadır. Okulu, ev ve yuva olarak içselleştiren öğrenciler doğal olarak öğretmenlerini de aile olarak görmektedirler. Öğrencilerin, okulu kendi evleri, öğretmenlerini ailesinden sonra ikici aile olarak görmesi ve okul müdürlerini lider ve yönetici olarak algılaması eğitim açısından olumlu kabul edilip, okul ve sınıf içi eğitim-öğretim süreçlerinde göz önünde bulundurulabilir. Ayrıca araştırmada ulaşılan tüm metafor kategoriler birlikte değerlendirildiğinde öğrencilerin çoğunluğu “okul” kavramına ilişkin olumlu, somut ve cansız; “öğretmen” ve “müdür” kavramlarına ilişkin olumlu, somut ve canlı metaforlar ürettikleri; okul, öğretmen ve müdürün çocukların eğitim yaşamında önemli bir yer tuttuğu görülmüştür.

Metaforlar kişilerin fikirlerini açığa çıkardığı gibi onların gerçeklik algılarını da şekillendirirler. Bundan dolayı araştırmanın sonucunda ortaya çıkan metaforlar öğrencilerin okul müdürlerine, öğretmenlere ve okula yönelik algılarının ortaya konması, buna göre değerlendirmeler ve uygulamalar yapılması açısından önemlidir. Ayrıca öğrencilerin öğretmenlere, müdürlere ve okula yönelik algılarının okula bağlılıkları ve başarılarında önemli katkısı olduğu göz ardı edilmemelidir. Bu araştırmadan elde edilen sonuçları ile alan yazındaki diğer araştırma sonuçları arasında hem benzerlikler hem de tutarsızlıklar bulunmaktadır. Bu bağlamda eğitim alanında yapılan ve gelecekte yapılacak olan metaforik çalışmalar, bu ve benzeri araştırmalara önemli katkılar sağlayabilir.

REFERENCES

- Açıkgöz, K.Ü. (2002). *Aktif öğrenme*. İzmir: Eğitim Dünyası Yayınları.
- Adıgüzel, A. (2005). Avrupa Birliğine uyum sürecinde öğretmen niteliklerinde yeni bir boyut: bilgi okuryazarlığı. *Milli Eğitim*, 167, 355-364.
- Akan, D., Yalçın, S., & Yıldırım, İ. (2014). "Okul Müdürü" kavramına ilişkin öğretmenlerin metaforik algıları. *İlköğretim Online*, 13(1), 169-179.
- Akkaya, N., Özdemir, E. E., Akbulut, S. & Çıvıgın, H. (2017). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin okul, öğretmen ve öğrenci kavramları üzerine metaforik algıları. *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde (s.167)*. Alanya/Antalya.
- Aktay, S. (2017). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının sosyal ağ metaforları. F. Güneş (Ed.), *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde (s. 19)*. Alanya/Antalya.
- Altun, S. A., & Apaydın, Ç. (2013). Kız ve erkek öğretmen adaylarının "eğitim" kavramına ilişkin metaforik algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 19(3), 329-354.
- Aydın, F., & Eser Ünalı, Ü. (2010). The analysis of geography teacher candidates' perceptions towards "geography" concept with the help of metaphors. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(2), 600-622.
- Aydın, İ. S. (2011). Türkçe kavramının metaforik algılanma biçimleri. *Folklor/Edebiyat*, 66, 173-187.
- Aydoğdu, E. (2008). *İlköğretim okullarındaki öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin sahip oldukları okul algıları ile ideal okul algılarının metaforlar (Mecazlar) yoluyla analizi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.
- Balcı, A. (1999). *Metaphorical images of school: School perceptions of students, teachers and parents from four selected schools* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Balcı, A. (2011). Okul metaforları: İlköğretim müfettişlerinin okul algıları. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(44), 27-38.
- Başaran Uğur, A. R. & Baysal, S. (2017). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin İngilizce öğretmeni kavramına ilişkin metaforik algıları. *Journal of International Social Research*, 10(52), 730-736.
- Bektaş, M. & Pehlivan, N. (2018). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin "yüksek lisans" kavramına yönelik metaforik algıları. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 8(1), 211-227.
- Berliner, D. C. (1990). If the metaphor fits, why not wear it? The teacher as executive. *Theory into practice*, 29(2), 85-93.
- Bircan, T. S. (2018). Metaphors of history teachers candidates in Turkey on teaching profession. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 4(2), 83-93.
- Blenkiron, P. (2005). Stories and analogies in cognitive behaviour therapy: A clinical review. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 33(1), 45-59.
- Bozkurt, E. & Turan, M. (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerinin eğitim ve üniversiteye ilişkin metaforik algıları. *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde (s. 96)*. Alanya/Antalya.
- Bozlk, M. (2002). The college student as learner: Insight gained through metaphor analysis. *College Student Journal*, 36(1).
- Bredeson, P. (1988). Perspectives on schools: Metaphors an management in education. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 26(3),293,309.
- Briggs, A R. (2005). Middle managers in english further education colleges. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 33(1), 27-50.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2003). Becoming a principal: Role conception, initial socialization, role-identity transformation, purposeful engagement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(4), 468-503.

- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., ve Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri (on üçüncü baskı)*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Can, N. (1998). Öğretmen ve yöneticinin etkililiğinin öğretimdeki rolü. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 13(13), 55-69.
- Çelik, H. (2016). An examination of cross sectional change in student's metaphorical perceptions towards heat, temperature and energy concepts. *International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology*, 4(3), 229-245.
- Çelikten, M. (2006). Kültür ve öğretmen metaforları. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(21), 269-283.
- Cerit, Y. (2006). Öğrenci, öğretmen ve yöneticilerin okul kavramıyla ilgili metaforlara ilişkin görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 6(3), 669-699.
- Cerit, Y. (2008). Öğrenci, öğretmen ve yöneticilerin müdür kavramı ile ilgili metaforlara ilişkin görüşleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 33(147), 3-13.
- Clarke, R. H. (1997). Five Metaphors for Educators. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED407408. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED407408.pdf>
- Cornell, D., Shukla, K., & Konold, T. R. (2016). Authoritative school climate and student academic engagement, grades, and aspirations in middle and high schools. *AERA Open*, 2(2), 2332858416633184. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416633184>
- Creed, A. & McIlveen, P. (2018). Metaphor identification as a research method for the study of career. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 18(1), 27-44.
- Crowley, R. J. & Mills, J. C. (1986). The nature and construction of therapeutic metaphors for children. *British Journal of Experimental & Clinical Hypnosis*, 3(2), 69-76.
- Daane, A. R., Haglund, J., Robertson, A. D., Close, H. G., & Scherr, R. E. (2018). The pedagogical value of conceptual metaphor for secondary science teachers. *Science Education*, 102(5), 1051-1076.
- De Grauwe, A. (2005). Improving the quality of education through school-based management: learning from international experiences. *International review of education*, 51(4), 269-287.
- De Guerrero, M. & Villamil, O. S. (2001). Metaphor analysis in second/foreign language instruction: A sociocultural perspective. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED461990.pdf>
- De Guerrero, M. C., & Villamil, O. S. (2002). Metaphorical conceptualizations of ESL teaching and learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 6(2), 95-120.
- De Guerrero, M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Exploring ESL teachers' roles through metaphor analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 341-351.
- Deniş Çeliker, H., & Akar, A. (2015). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Doğaya İlişkin Metaforları. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(2), 101-119. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/aeukefd/issue/30437/367548>
- Derrington, M. L. (2013). Metaphors and meaning: Principals' perceptions of teacher evaluation implementation. *Education Leadership Review*, 14(3), 22-28.
- Doğan, D. (2014) Öğretmen adaylarının perspektifinden okul kavramının metaforlarla analizi. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi*, 7(3), 361-382.
- Dönmez, Ö. (2008). *Türk Eğitim Sisteminde kullanılan yönetici metaforları (Kayseri ili örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Erciyes Üniversitesi, Kayseri.
- Egüz, Ş., & Öntaş, T. (2018). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin "Öğretmen" kavramına ilişkin kullandıkları Metaforlar. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(1), 79-91.
- Ekici, G., Baş, M., & Kızılkaya, O. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının "öğretmenlik mesleği" kavramına ilişkin algılarının belirlenmesi: bir metafor analizi çalışması.[Determination of perception regarding the "teaching profession" of teacher candidates: a work of metaphor analysis]. *International Journal Of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 8(28).

- Ekiz, D. & Koçyiğit, Z. (2013). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin “öğretmen” kavramına ilişkin metaforlarının tespit edilmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(2), 439-458.
- Eminoğlu Küçüktepe, S., & Gürültü, E. (2014). Öğretmenlerin" yapılandırmacı öğretmen" kavramına ilişkin algılarına yönelik metafor çalışması örneği. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(2).
- ERIC (2018). *Metafor*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=metaphor> adresinden 28 Aralık 2018 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Everett, S. (2018). “Untold Stories”: Cultivating consequential writing with a black male student through a critical approach to metaphor. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 53(1), 34.
- Fennel, H. A. (1996). *An exploration of principals' metaphors for leaders and power*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED399626.pdf>
- Filiz, M. A. (2018). *Ortaokul çağındaki çocukların beden eğitimi ve spor dersine yönelik tutumları ile okula bağlanma düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [The relationship between secondary school age children's attitudes towards physical education and sports course and the levels of attachment to school]. Unpublished Master Thesis, Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. (2004). School engagement: potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59-109. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Gök, B., & Erdoğan, T. (2010). Investigation of pre-service teachers' perceptions about concept of technology through metaphor analysis. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(2).
- Gök, M. (2017). Bişkek Türk İlk ve Orta Okulu Öğrencileri ve Öğretmenlerinin" Okul" Kavramı Algılarına İlişkin Metaforların İncelenmesi. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(2), 23-44.
- Griffin, C. B. (2014). *School racial climate and the academic achievement of African American high school students: The mediating role of school engagement* (Doctoral dissertation). University of South Carolina, Chapel Hill. Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/2602>
- Helvacı, M. A., & Aydoğan, İ. (2011). Etkili okul ve etkili okul müdürüne ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2011(8).
- Hernández-Amorós, M. J., & Martínez Ruiz, M. A. (2018). Principals' metaphors as a lens to understand how they perceive leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(4), 602-623.
- Hill, L. G., & Werner, N. E. (2006). Affiliative motivation, school attachment, and aggression in school. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(2), 231-246. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pits.20140>
- Inbar, D. E. (1996). The free educational prison. *Metaphors and Images Educational Research*, 38(1), 77-92.
- İnceçay, V. (2015). " The Foreign Language Classroom is Like an Airplane" Metaphorical Conceptualizations of Teachers' Beliefs. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(2), 74-96.
- Işık, D. & Erdoğan, N. G. (2017). İlkokul öğrencilerinin “öğretmen” algılarında öğretmen değişikliğinin rolü. *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde* (s. 19). Alanya/Antalya.
- Jensen, D. (2006). Metaphors as a bridge to understanding educational and social contexts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 36-54.
- Jimerson, S. R., Campos, E., & Greif, J. L. (2003). Toward an understanding of definitions and measures of school engagement and related terms. *The California School Psychologist*, 8(1), 7-27. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03340893>
- Kalyoncu, R. (2012). Görsel sanatlar öğretmeni adaylarının “öğretmenlik” kavramına ilişkin metaforları/Visual arts teacher candidates' metaphors related to concept of" teaching". *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(20).
- Kararımak, A. (2015). Çocukla psikolojik danışmada metaforik süreç. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*. 5 (43) ,115-127.

- Kıral, E. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının algılarına göre öğretmen metaforları. *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 57-65.
- Koçak, C. (2013). Metaphorical perceptions of teacher candidates towards the school concept: Lotus flower model. *Mevlana International Journal of Education(MIJE)*, 3(4), 43-56.
- Konaklı, T., & Göğüş, N. (2013). Aday öğretmenlerin sosyal girişimcilik özellikleri ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty (GUJGEF)*, 33(2).
- Korkmaz, M., & Çevik, M. S. (2018). Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin müdür kavramına ilişkin metaforik algıları. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science/Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi*, 11(4).
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). Cognitive-linguistic comments on metaphor identification. *Language and Literature*, 11(1), 74-78.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnason, M. (2015). *Metaforlar, hayat anlam ve dil* (G. Y. Demir, Çev.). İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- Leithwood, K. (2005). Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(6), 619-629.
- Levitt, H., Korman, Y., & Angus, L. (2000). A metaphor analysis in treatments of depression: Metaphor as a marker of change. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 13(1), 23-35.
- Linn, G. B., Sherman, R., & Gill, P. B. (2007). Making meaning of educational leadership: The principalship in metaphor. *NASSP Bulletin*, 91(2), 161-171.
- Loder, T. L., & Spillane, J. P. (2005). Is a principal still a teacher?: US women administrators' accounts of role conflict and role discontinuity. *School Leadership & Management*, 25(3), 263-279.
- Lum, B. J. (1997). Student mentality: Intentionalist perspectives about the principal. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(3), 210-218.
- Martinez, M. A., Sauleda, N., & Huber, G. L. (2001). Metaphors as blueprints of thinking about teaching and learning. *Teaching and Teacher education*, 17(8), 965-977.
- Monroe, C. E. S. (2003). *An analysis of principalship metaphors at the beginning of the new millennium* (Unpublished master thesis). Faculty of the Graduate School, The University of North Carolina, Greensboro.
- Morgan, G. (1998). *Yönetim ve örgüt teorilerinde metafor* (G. Bulut & Z. Dicleli, Çev.). İstanbul: Mess.
- Mould, T. J., Oades, L. G., & Crowe, T. P. (2010). The use of metaphor for understanding and managing psychotic experiences: A systematic review. *Journal of Mental Health*, 19(3), 282-293.
- Nalçacı, A., & Bektaş, F. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının okul kavramına ilişkin algıları. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(1).
- Nikitina, L., & Furuoka, F. (2008). "A Language Teacher is Like...": Examining Malaysian Students' Perceptions of Language Teachers through Metaphor Analysis. *Online Submission*, 5(2), 192-205.
- 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), 293-310.
- Ogurlu, Ü., Öpengin, E., & Hızlı, E. (2015). Üstün yetenekli öğrencilerin okul ve öğretmene ilişkin metaforik algıları. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (46)67-83.
- Otto, M. W. (2000). Stories and metaphors in cognitive-behavior therapy. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 7(2), 166-172.
- 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.
- Özan, M. B., & Demir, C. (2011). Farklı lise türlerine göre öğretmen ve öğrencilerin okul kültürü metaforu algıları. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(2).
- Özdemir, M. (2012). Lise öğrencilerinin metaforik okul algılarının çeşitli değişkenler bakımından incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 37(163).

- Özdemir, O. & Beyhatın, F. (2017). Hikaye haritası yönteminin ilkokul 4.sınıf öğrencilerinin okuduğunu anlama başarılarına etkisi ve öğrencilerin hikaye haritası kavramına yönelik metaforik algıları. *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde (s. 171). Alanya/Antalya.*
- Özdemir, S., & Sezgin, A. G. F. (2002). Etkili okullar ve öğretim liderliği. *Kirgizistan Manas Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(3), 266-282.
- Özdemir, Y. & Koruklu, N. (2013). Parental attachment, school attachment and life satisfaction in early adolescence. *Elementary Education Online*, 12(3), 836-848. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/90476>
- Özgenel, M., Baydar, F., & Caliskan Yılmaz, F. (2018). School Climate as a Predictor of Secondary School Students' School Attachment. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, 78, 87-116
- Pilav, S., & Elkatmış, M. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının türkçe kavramına ilişkin metaforları. *Turkish Studies*, 8(4), 1207-1220.
- Poveda, D., Matsumoto, M., Morgade, M., & Alonso, E. (2018). Photographs as a research tool in child studies: Some analytical metaphors and choices. *Qualitative Research in Education*.
- Saban, A. (2004). Giriş düzeyindeki sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının "öğretmen" kavramına ilişkin algılarının metafor analizi yoluyla incelenmesi, *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(2),131-155.
- Saban, A. (2008). Okula ilişkin metaforlar. *Kuram ve Uygulama Eğitim Yönetim*, 14(55),459-496.
- Saban, A., Koçbeker, B. N., & Saban, A. (2006). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen kavramına ilişkin algılarının metafor analizi yoluyla incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 6(2), 461-522.
- Şahin, A. & Demirbaş, İ. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının ahilik değerleriyle ilgili zihinsel imgeleri (Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Örneği). *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde (s. 19). Alanya/Antalya.*
- Sarıtaş, E., & Çelik, K. (2013). İlkokul öğrencilerinin sınıf kavramına ilişkin metaforik algıları. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 10(1), 1185-1201.
- Schechter, C., Shaked, H., Ganon-Shilon, S., & Goldratt, M. (2018). Leadership metaphors: School principals' sense-making of a national reform. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 17(1), 1-26.
- Selçuk, G. & Ataç, A. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının kişilik tiplerine ve bazı değişkenlere göre sınıf yönetimine ilişkin metaforlarının incelenmesi. *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde (s. 48). Alanya/Antalya.*
- Shaughnessy, J. J., Zechmeister, E. B., & Zechmeister, J. S. (2016). *Research methods in psychology* (İ. Göz, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Shuell, T. J. (1990). Teaching and learning as problem solving. *Theory into practice*, 29(2), 102-108.
- Susar Kırmızı, F., & Tarhan, Ö. (2017). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin demokrasiye ilişkin oluşturdukları metaforlar. *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde (s. 119). Alanya/Antalya.*
- Toker-Gökçe, A., & Bülbül, T. (2014). Okul bir insan bedenidir: Meslek lisesi öğrencilerinin okul algılarına yönelik bir metafor çalışması. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(1), 63-88.
- Tolunay Ateş, Ö. (2016). Öğrencilerin öğretmen ve okul metaforları. *Uluslararası Güncel Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1), 78-93.
- Töremen, F., & Döş, İ. (2009). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin müfettişlik kavramına ilişkin metaforik algıları. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 13(3), 295-306.
- Tortop, H. S. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının üniversite hocası hakkındaki metaforları ve bir değerlendirme aracı olarak metafor. *Journal of Higher Education & Science/Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 3(2).
- Turhan, M., ve Yaraş, Z. (2013). Öğretmen ve öğrencilerin öğretmen, disiplin, müdür, sınıf kuralları, ödül ve ceza kavramlarına ilişkin metafor algıları. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 23(1), 129-145.
- Türk Dil Kurumu (2018). Güncel Türkçe sözlük. Retrieved from <http://www.tdk.gov.tr/>

- Tüzel, E. ve Şahin, D. (2014). İlköğretim birinci kademe öğrencilerinin okul yöneticilerine ilişkin metaforları. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2014(17).
- Uysal, H. & Çakır Uysal, S. (2017). Resim-iş eğitimi öğrencilerinin çocuk resmine yönelik metaforları. *I. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu (USEAS2017) bildiriler kitabı içinde* (s. 115). Alanya/Antalya.
- Wang, M. T., Chow, A., Hofkens, T., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2015). The trajectories of student emotional engagement and school burnout with academic and psychological development: Findings from Finnish adolescents. *Learning and Instruction*, 36, 57-65. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2014.11.004>
- Wang, M. T., Willett, J. B., & Eccles, J. S. (2011). The assessment of school engagement: Examining dimensionality and measurement invariance by gender and race/ethnicity. *Journal of School Psychology*, 49(4), 465-480. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2011.04.001>
- Wood, M. (2005). The fallacy of misplaced leadership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(6), 1101-1121.
- Yalçın, M. ve Erginer, A. (2012). İlköğretim okullarında okul müdürüne ilişkin metaforik algılar 1. *Öğretmen Eğitimi ve Eğitimcileri Dergisi*, 1(2), 229-256.
- Yazar, T., Özekinci, B., & Lala, Ö. (2017). Öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin değerler eğitimi kavramına ilişkin metaforik algıları. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 5(3), 245-269.
- Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, N. ve Uğur, M. (2011). Öğrencilerin algısından okul müdürü imgelerinin karikatürize ifadeleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 19(2), 409-426.
- Yıldızlı, H., Acar Erdol, T., Baştuğ, M., & Bayram, K. (2018). A meta-synthesis on Turkish metaphor studies of teachers. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 43(193).
- Yılmaz, S. & Polat, S. (2012). Metaphor Perceptions of Primary School Administrators and Teachers Towards the Institution They Work for. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 669-678.
- Yob, I. M. (2003). Thinking constructively with metaphors. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 22(2), 127-138.
- Zapata, G. C., & Lacorte, M. (2007). Preservice and inservice instructors' metaphorical constructions of second language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(3), 521-534.
- Zhu, J. & Zhu, G. (2018). Understanding student teachers' professional identity transformation through metaphor: An international perspective, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 44(4), 500-504. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1450819>