

What Do University Students Liken Faculty Members to?

Füsün G. Alacapınar, Necmettin Erbakan University Ahmet Keleşođlu Education
Faculty Educational Programs and Teaching ABD, Turkey

The Asian Conference on Education 2015
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

People may express their ideas and feelings by resorting to metaphors. Various names are given to this usage including metaphor, similitude, allegory, metonymy, etc. It entails a strong art of expression.

Such metaphors may supply researchers with consistent information about education environments. Mutual feelings and ideas of parties in an education environment may have its influence on the sound working of the environment concerned. A teacher may be likened to some specific entities in the eyes of his/her students and this is only natural. Examination of this phenomenon may significantly contribute to the development and evaluation of programmes followed in training teachers.

What, in the eyes of university students, a faculty member means and what do students liken them? Do these metaphors and expressions vary significantly with respect to gender? What do students think about this?

The present survey used focus group interviewing as qualitative and quantitative survey methodology. Students in education faculties of two universities in Konya were asked what they liken their teaching staff. There was focus group interviewing with students randomly selected from among respondents to identify metaphors and allegories.

Students refer to teaching staff mostly by using negative or positive metaphors. In the focus group meeting they explained why they do it. Basing on these, it is possible to say that students may have their positive or negative metaphors, feelings and ideas about teaching staff and some of these vary by gender.

Key words: University students, Simile (metaphor), teaching staff

iafor

The International Academic Forum

www.iafor.org

Introduction

People may express their ideas and feelings by resorting to metaphors. Various names are given to this usage including metaphor, similitude, allegory, metonymy, etc. It entails a strong art of expression and as such it also contains indirect statement of what cannot be stated directly. People may use metaphors, either positive or negative, to express their ideas and feelings about others who have some influence on them. For example a very strong child may be referred to as “just like a lion” or the term “wise man of the universe” may be attributed to a very informed person. There are all metaphors. Faculty members may be quite important persons in the eyes of their students. Students are in interaction with them. As a result, both students and faculty members may liken each other, positively or negatively, to some entities or associate each other with some characteristics, again either negative or positive.

In a full metaphor there may be three characteristics as the one who is likened, the one who likens and the way of likening. Any metaphor with all these elements is called “teşbih-i belîğ” (fine, full and explicit metaphor). However, not all metaphors are like this. There are cases where one of the three elements is absent. For example in the metaphor “mouse roared” there is no reference to lion and the way of likening. The metaphor “came to my rescue as Hızır in a very difficult time of mine”, for example has no clarity as to who was like Hızır.

Regardless of the way in which metaphor is used, it encompasses analogy in its logic. Analogy is to make a logical inference by establishing a connection between two objects, phenomena which are different in appearance but share the same characteristics in essence. For example, the inference “There is life in the world because there is water; so there should be life in Mars as well if there is water there” is an analogy. Water is the basic resemblance of the two objects. The inference here is to reach a conclusion on the basis of a common and fundamental element (Sönmez, 2008:164). In a sense, there is a transfer of information. In fact, the Greek word metaphor (metapherein) means transfer (Oxford English Dictionary, 1996). Here, for purposes of making an idea or feeling clearer and understandable or enriching a narration or making an inference, there may be a transfer to a likened object, phenomenon or action, making the things more concrete. For example in the metaphor “teacher is like the sun”, teacher may have been likened to the sun in that he/she eliminates ignorance, approaches students with affection (gives them warmth), guides and shows them the way, etc. (Alacapınar, 2011).

In this context any metaphor can be examined by at least three respects: 1. What is the subject matter of the metaphor? This must be put clearly. For example in a metaphor like “Teaching is a godly profession” the subject matter is the profession of teaching. In other words it is something that is like something else. 2. What is it likened to? In a sense, what is the source of likening? Here the likened is the God, it is the source of likening. 3. What is the direction in likening? Which characteristics does it embody? In our present example, it may be that just as the God conveys human beings what is correct and wants them to live happily, behave good and honest and enjoy success, teacher wants the same for his/her students (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003 Cited by: Saban, 2004; Alacapınar, 2011).

Metaphors help in more concrete expression of ideas and feelings and thus may facilitate their comprehension. Further, since they go in meaning beyond what is actually meant metaphor can be considered as a more enriched form of narration. These meanings may also change the contexts used. They may be used for praising or denouncing. In a sense, their meaning may depend on the person concerned, the environment in which they are used, timing, community, personality and intensity of thought. Also, the character of the person concerned and values of a given culture may be inferred from metaphors used. Hence, metaphors may be used in researches as an important source of data (Booth, Cited by Girmen, 2007).

Teaching staff in universities are persons bearing importance for their students since they are in communication for 4-5 hours a day for a period of at least 4 years. In this context, students may judge teaching staff by what they observe in them and express this by using negative or positive metaphors. Hence, the examination of these metaphors may bear importance in terms of both throwing light upon existing state of affairs and of developing new curricula in teacher training or improving already existing ones.

Students may liken teaching staff with reference to some characteristics highly valued by the given culture if they regard them as consistent, reliable and virtuous persons and, to the contrary, with reference to negative characteristics if they find them inconsistent, unreliable and dishonest. Positive and negative characteristics of teaching staff as their students observe may affect education and tests significantly. The teaching staff constitutes one of the important variables in education processes. Their success in applying the curriculum in education environments may significantly affect the possession of achievements (objectives) by students. Indeed, the possibility of materializing the achievement envisaged by the curriculum may be higher if the teaching staff is equipped with expected qualifications and capable of reflecting these in education environments. Studies show that variables such as age, gender, outer appearance, way of dressing, the duration of past academic career, professional status, salary etc. are not so important. Instead, studies show that what really makes difference are as follows: Feedback, correction, hints, reinforcement, ensuring active participation of students, affection, a proper teaching and learning strategy; use of theory, methodology, techniques and tactics; rational utilization of time, providing favourable learning environments, methods of reasoning, enabling students to use necessary materials and instruments, monitoring and evaluation, etc. (Özçelik, 1974; Bloom, 1976; Aksu, 1981; Yıldırım, 1982; Senemoğlu, 1987; Arslan, 1996; Kapıcıoğlu, 2006; Alacapınar, 2008; Sönmez, 2008). Chances of being associated with positive objects and phenomena are higher if the teaching staff is engaged in what is stated above and the reverse if not. So, looking at these indicators it may be possible to make sound judgements about the teaching staff. In fact, there are many studies in the country and abroad on this issue (Saban, 2004; Kadunz, Straber, 2004; Williams, Wake 2004; Saban, Koçbeker, Saban 2005; Çelikten 2006; Girmen 2007; Ocak, Gündüz, 2008; Çubukçu, 2008; Alacapınar 2011).

Problem Sentence

For university students, what teaching staff implies and what do they think they are like? Do these vary significantly by gender? What are the related opinions of students?

Sub-problems

1. What does the term **teaching staff** mean to university students? Do these vary significantly by gender? What are the related opinions of students?
2. What do university students liken teaching staff in this university? Do these vary by gender? What are the related opinions of students?

Methodology

Qualitative and quantitative survey techniques were used together in the study. Students were asked to write down in items what they likened their teaching staff. Then they were asked to tell about their ideas and feelings about the teaching staff which were later obtained by using open ended data collection instrument. The relevance and appropriateness of questions were checked with three subject specialists and a **correlation of .81 was found** among these questions. This was taken as a proof of the validity of coverage. These data were then examined through the method of “content analysis.” In this context, responses given by each student were divided into categories with respect to nouns, adjectives, adverbs and pronouns used and logical consistency was checked.

What the term “teaching staff” meant in gender terms for university students, their ideas and feelings about teaching staff and what they likened them were tabulated and similar and different ones were taken separately. In order to give depth, detail and meaning to qualitative survey, similar and different characteristics were marked and their relationship was examined by calculating their percentages and frequencies.

In order to assess the internal consistency reliability of the survey, relationship between feelings and ideas and characteristics of metaphors were examined by three experts and a **correlation of .78** was found among the opinions of these experts. This is accepted as survey’s **reliability coefficient**. As to external reliability, information collected was openly presented to the working group and stored so as to be made available to researchers when requested.

Semi-structured focus group interviews were conducted with female and male students randomly selected from each class. Responses given by students were recorded and then analysed. Grammar mistakes in responses given by students as they were recorded were later corrected with the approval of students concerned. The survey report includes these responses.

Universe and Sample Working Group

A working group was identified instead of determining a universe and sample. The survey was carried out over students enrolled to Faculties of Education in Konya Selçuk and Necmettin Erbakan Universities in the period 2102-2014 and teaching staff attending to classes of these students. The working group consisted of 261 students.

Distribution of Students by Class and Gender

Table 1 gives the gender distribution of students.

Table 1. *Gender distribution of students*

	Female		Male		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Students	207	.79	54	.21	261	100

As shown in Table 1 there are 207 female and 54 male students in classes. So there are 261 students in total whose views were solicited. To see whether there was any significant difference between the number of female and male students t-test was used and the value found (9.67) showed that the difference was significant at level 01. Then it can be said that the number of responding female students was significantly higher the number of male students.

Findings

Operations in this part include the collection of data related to sub-problems, examination of data through focus group interviews, statistical analyses by using percentages and frequencies, tabulations and inferences.

For university students what does the term “teaching staff” express?

1. For university students what does the term “teaching staff” express by gender? Related data is given below in Table II.

Table II. *For University Students What Does the Term “Teaching Staff” Mean in Positive Terms by Gender?*

Female	F	%	Male	F	%
Prepares for life, conveys information and knowledge, helps build an occupation	67	32.37		1	1.85
Guides, shows the way, gives advise	21	10.14	Guides, shows the way, gives advise	32	59.26
The one keeps studying in the university; delivers courses as professor, associate professor, assistant professor etc.	83	40.09	Ideal, trains students and help them in their courses	9	16.66
Having specialization and career; well educated in his/her field, well-informed	21	10.14	Wise person	7	13.00
Respected, understanding, affectionate, constructive, tolerant, a different person	5	2.45			
Conducts research, engages in synthesis and studies of universal importance; offers different perspectives, attaches importance to practice and engaged in it	10	5.00	Library, sugar, artist, hero, flower	5	9.26
	207			54	

According to Table II, while for 92% of **female** students who stated positive opinion teaching staff means “*those with academic career and education who continue their studies in the university; deliver courses as professor, associate professor, assistant professor; prepare students for life; convey information and knowledge; help build an occupation; guide and give advice, Google*”, the same term means “*informed and well educated person who guides, gives advice and education students*” for 89% of male students. It can be said that some ideas and perceptions are common to both female and male students. Written statements by students on this are summarized and presented below:

Why does the term teaching staff suggest such a positive meaning to you?

*Student 1: No one can be a faculty member **without attending a university** and specializing there. They have their careers and have undergone hard tests. And they **deliver courses, educate us**. They are patient, tolerant and friendly mates with profound information. They are experienced, well-equipped, cultured and respected leaders. This is what the term means to me.*

*Student 2: They teach us **how to teach**, our future **profession**. They build in us information and skills. They are those making us ready for life and our profession.*

*Student 3: **They show us the way, guide us**. They are **artists** at the same time since they train and shape people. One can see them as library since they are so knowledgeable. As understanding as parents, with wisdom and knowledge they show us our way to go. They are educationists knowing well how to teach and assess. They listen to, understand and value their students. They are tolerant, emphatic, friendly and affectionate persons.*

Student 4: It evokes **researcher**. They **explore** and **innovate**. These are people **who think different** than the way we do. They are **intelligent** and at **extremes**. They are heroes for me. They are wise, selected, source of light with self-confidence and influence.

From these responses, it can be said that in general students view teaching staff as *informed and intelligent persons with academic titles who stand at extremes, teach and prepare their students for future, explore and innovate*. Their qualification of teaching staff as such may derive from decisions made while observing the activities and outputs of teaching staff. Students may also be influenced by processes and procedures through which people become academicians.

For university students what does the term “teaching staff” mean **in negative terms** by Gender? Related data is presented below in Table III.

Table III. *For University Students What Does the Term “Teaching Staff” Mean in Negative Terms by Gender?*

Female	F	%	Male	F	%
Assistant is a person doing some routine jobs and holds that position upon some kind of favouritism	2	16,67	Megalomaniac	2	33,33
Do everything or nothing	2	16,67	Pitiable person with exhausted brain after hard working	1	16,67
Disciplined, authoritarian	1	8,33	Person expecting increase in his salary	1	16,67
Person abusing the student and causing him to flank for his personal interests	5	41,66	Cübbeli Ahmet hoca (a prominent TV and media figure with his ideas on religion)	1	16,67
Rather strange persons, missing their sleep at night amidst a deck of books	2	16,67	Chinese torture	1	16,67
	12			6	

As Table III shows 67% of **female** students attribute such characteristics to teaching staff as “*strange persons, causing students to flank for their own interests, who may do everything or just nothing, reaching their present posts by favouritism*”. All **male** students, on the other hand, used the expressions “*megalomaniacs, pitiable person with exhausted brain after hard work, expecting rise in salary, Cübbeli Ahmet hoca, and a kind of Chinese torture...*” It can be said that negative statements by female and male students do not coincide. Further, negative statements are used by only 12 out of 207 female students (%6) and by 6 out of 54 male students (11%). To see whether there was any significant difference between **positive and negative statements** t-test was used and the values found (12.25 and 13) showed that the difference was **significant** at level 01. Then it can be said that students mostly used positive statement while describing the teaching staff.

Why does the term “teaching staff” suggest such negative meanings to you?

A focus group interview was conducted with 3 female and 1 male students who wanted to respond to this question. Outcomes are given below. Some flaws in statements were corrected by the researcher by taking the consent of students.

Female student 1: That is how some faculty members I encounter behave. They flunk us for paying their house and credit card debts. They do it. I heard it from them.

Female student 2: A friend of mine is married to an academic. They have no home life and time they spare for themselves.

Female student 3: They go sleepless; you can tell it by looking at their faces.

Male student 1: Some of them just go senile. There is one who apply us a kind of Chinese torture. They are so greedy to do anything for more money.

As can be inferred from these statements some female and male students consider teaching staff as “*strange persons flanking their students for their personal interests, remaining sleepless at night with their books, who can do everything or nothing, having megalomaniac features, expecting rise in their salary, going senile as a result of intensive work, Cübbeli Ahmet Hoca, exercising Chinese torture, coming to their post by favouritism, etc.* Such negative attributions may derive from their attitudes and behaviour in academic environments. However, given that the number of female and male students with such negative attributions is quite low, it can be said that teaching staff is still highly valued by students.

What do university students liken teaching staff?

Table IV below presents information as to **positive attributions** of university students to teaching staff and whether these attributions vary by gender.

*Table IV: What University Students Liken Faculty Members in **Positive** Terms, Distribution by Gender*

Alive, not alive	F		Alive, not alive	F	
	(Female)	%		(Male)	%
Paper-pen, notebook	2	01	Paper-pen	4	07
Book, inscription, encyclopaedia	7	03	Library, book, glossary	4	07
Source of knowledge, expert, researcher, wise person, scientist, teacher, instructor, guide, trainer-coach	80	39	A multi-colour pen	1	01
Sound of awareness	4	02	Godly, Einstein, digging hole with a needle	32	59
Light, source of light, candle	49	24	Sky	2	04
A remote command car	1	00	Self-confident, mature, judge, arbitrator	5	10
Machine, oven, stairs, computer	4	02	Disciplined soldier, commander, cavalier	5	10
Ant, bee, lightning bug, lion, turtle	16	08	Rose	1	01
A friend, one of us	14	07			
Tailor, gardener	5	02			
Angel, Nirvana	6	02			
Family, parents	10	05			
Prime minister, shepherd, painter, farmer	6	03			
Tree, plane tree, rose	3	01			
	207			54	

As can be seen in Table IV female students use the following metaphors to describe the teaching staff: *“paper-pen, notebook, book, inscription, encyclopaedia, source of knowledge, scientist, specialist, researcher, guide, coach, sound of awareness, light, source of light, candle, remote control car, machine, oven, stairs, computer, art, bee, lightning bug, lion, turtle, friend, one of us, tailor, gardener, angel, Nirvana, family, parents, Prime Minister, shepherd, painter, farmer, tree, plane tree and rose.* Metaphors by male students are as follows: *“paper-pen, library, glossary, book, multi-colour pencil, sky, godly, Einstein, digging hole with a needle, self-confident, mature, judge, arbitrator, disciplined soldier, commander, cavalier and rose.* To see whether there was any significant relationship between **positive statements and gender** t-test was used and some t values were found **significant** at level 0.5. On the basis of this it can be said that there is a significant relationship between gender and metaphors used for teaching staff. While **female students’ positive attributions** more frequently include *“source of information, specialist, researcher, scientist, teacher, guide, coach, light, source of light and candle”,* **males** focus on *“Godly, Einstein, digging hole with a needle, self-confident, mature, judge, arbitrator, disciplined soldier, commander and cavalier.”* Written statements by students on this are summarized and presented below:

“Tirelessly engaged in research; appears as he really is; mastery manages the class; make students like the course; knows well how to teach and assess; gives explanations; develops theses and projects; busy all the time and works hard; makes good use of available time; thinks in a different way and has different ideas; open to criticism; not selective in students; objective and honest; updates oneself; open to novelties; progressing in his field; teaching the reality and what is true; has a role in putting our life in order; listens and behaves tolerant; in communication and empathy; nationalist and enlightened; speaks foreign languages; trains top level managers; has a specific world view; able to use technology in his field; encourages students to research; shapes up the student; constructive, accepted by his society; well off with a good salary; dresses well; fulfils the requirements of his profession; agile, interpreting; always thoughtful; with foresight and knows his students well.”

Why do you make such **positive attributions** for teaching staff?

A focus group interview was conducted with 4 female and 2 male students who wanted to respond to this question. Outcomes are given below. Some flaws in statements were corrected by the researcher by taking the consent of students.

Female student 1: When there is mention of university teaching staff I think of a person conducting research, developing theses and projects and solving problems. In fact there are few of such people in universities, but there must be.

Female student 2: An academic should not only engage in research but should also know students well, treat them fair, tolerantly and affectionately and teach them what he knows. Before my enrolment to school I thought of this about an academic and I still think so.

Female student 3: I agree with what my friends say. I used to think this way before enrolling the university and I still want to keep thinking the same way even after seeing some really bad examples.

Female student 4: In addition to all these, the teacher must also encourage us to research, but I have seen very few doing this in the university.

Male student 1: Teaching staff is a farsighted one, one engaged in research and effective communication. He continuously renews himself, and so on...

Male student 2: I think he is the one who loves his country and nation. This is sufficient for me. I was my opinion before enrolling the university too. I agree with what my friends say, but for me the love for the country, nation and duty comes first...

Table V below presents information as to **negative attributions** of university students to teaching staff and whether these attributions vary by gender.

*Table V: What University Students Liken Faculty Members in **Negative** Terms, Distribution by Gender*

Alive, not alive	F (Female)	%	Alive, not alive	F (male)	%
Colony state	3	14	Brick, coin box	2	09
Wall, stone	3	14	Rectangle	1	04
Box- box without any colour	3	14	Grammar rule, sound recording device, empty cube, system	4	18
Bogy	3	14	Everest peak, Kaf mountain	9	41
Robot- powder, balloon	3	14	Gargamel, ghoul, not looking human	3	14
Eraser-frame	5	18	A winter picture	1	04
Money-cracked jug	2	09	Scarecrow, small house appliances	2	09
	22			22	

As can be seen in Table V **female students** use the following **negative** metaphors to describe the teaching staff: “*eraser-frame, colonial state, wall, box-colourless box, bogymen, robot- powder, balloon, money-cracked jug and stone.*” For **male students** these negative metaphors are: “*brick, rectangle, grammar rule, Everest peak, ghoul, winter picture, money box, sound recorder, scarecrow, small household appliances, Kaf Mountain, inhuman, empty container, system.*” Data was checked to see if there is significant relationship between **negative metaphors and gender** and **no one-to-one common characteristic could be found for negative metaphors**. Given these data, it can be said that there is significant relationship between gender and **negative attributions** to teaching staff. As for **female** students, **negative** attributions include *eraser-frame, colonial state, wall, box-colourless box, bogymen, robot- powder and balloon*” while others by **male** students include “*Everest peak, Kaf mountain, grammar rule, sound recorder, empty container, system, ghoul, Gargamel, inhuman, brick, scarecrow and small household appliances.*”

Responses given by students to the question why they use such **negative attributions** for teaching staff can be summarized as follows:

“Unable to renew themselves; insufficient, despotic, authoritarian and aggressive persons with their rigid rules and sulky faces; they are not warm, have no family or social life; psychopathic and boring egoists engaged in discrimination; they are not consistent, and have their caprices; selfish people with conceit; disrespectful and unhappy; can do anything for personal achievement; just give marks to their students; they are pedants and behave unfair; don’t understand and care for students; have attained their present position after making concessions; unable to communicate; have some idea about the theory, but very poor in practice; conveying some trivial information only; unable to explain things by establishing cause-effect relations; unable to give any logic, to exemplify and deliver the course properly; unable to mobilize the active participation of students; don’t deserve the post they presently hold; not dressed properly; focus only on making some money; have dislike for their students, behave conceitedly, ideologically and exclude different ideas; ready to oppress others; have questions in mind without any idea about possible responses; try to be influential in every matter; turning into robots; unable to spare time for themselves; not open to different views...”

A focus group interview was conducted with 4 female and 2 male students who wanted to respond to this question. Outcomes are given below. Some flaws in statements were corrected by the researcher by taking the consent of students.

Female student 1: They have their favourite students and I have no doubt about it. They are not fair. They are generous in giving marks to those who flatter them, because this is the way how they made it in their times.

Female student 2: They are not properly dressed or let’s say they don’t know how to dress. They disappointed me. Only this? No, there are also many who don’t know how to deliver a course, they just read out from books or projectors and go...

Female student 3: They have so many mistakes and I don’t know which one to tell... Firstly, they are prejudiced, aggressive and have dislike for us... They seem to have

forgotten they were students once. It appears that they too have suffered during their studentship and now they take their revenge over us.

Female student 4: There are students mostly absent from their class, I sleep in some courses. They are too rigid and aggressive. They don't like us. They degrade us on every occasion.

Male student 1: They don't understand us and some despise students. I feel frightened when I have to go to their rooms. I am afraid to ask questions too.

Male student 2: Some of them are despotic. In my mind there are even some with psychological problems. They use universities to make Money. There are many faculty members here running after some projects leaving the task of lecturing to their assistants. They do not deserve what they earn and what they hold as title.

Conclusion

While **female students' positive attributions** include, in general, “*source of information, specialist, researcher, scientist, teacher, guide, coach, light, source of light and candle*”, **males** focus on “*Godly, Einstein, digging hole with a needle, self-confidant, mature, judge, arbitrator, disciplined soldier, commander and cavalier.*” **Female students** in general use the following **negative** metaphors to describe the teaching staff: “*eraser-frame, colonial state, wall, box-colourless box, bogymen, robot- powder, balloon, money-cracked jug and stone.*” For **male students**, on the other hand, negative metaphors include “*Everest peak, Kaf mountain, grammar rule, sound recorder, empty container, system ghoul, Gargamel, inhuman, brick, scarecrow, small household appliances...*”

Basing on **positive metaphors and statements**, it can be said that students regard teaching staff as “*informed and intelligent persons with academic titles as professor, associate professor, assistant professor etc., which stand at extremes, teach and prepare their students for future, who explore and innovate.*” Their positive description of teaching staff may derive from their activities and outputs observed while performing their profession and also from their personal characteristics (Girmen, 2007). To continue with, processes and procedures undergone before reaching the present status may be impressive for students. Finally, social attributions to university teaching staff may have led them to think this way. There are some studies supporting this explanation (Kadunz & Straber, 2004; William & Wake, 2004; Saban, 2004; Saban et. al., 2005; Çelikten, 2006; Çubukçu, 2008; Ocak and Gündüz, 2008; Alacapınar, 2013;

As to causes behind negative statements and metaphors one can refer to some undesired patterns of behaviour that teaching staff display in the university (Sönmez, 2008). Indeed, students spoke supportively of this possibility during focus group interviews: “They have their favourite students, I can tell this positively. I mean they are not fair. Many do not know how to deliver a course. They just read out from books or projected materials and then go. They are rigid and aggressive. They don't like us and despise in every occasion. Some are too despotic and there are even some who are psychologically problematic. University is only a platform for making money in their eyes.” Such patterns of behaviour on the part of teaching staff may also affect

students' achievement since they rule out possibilities of feedback, correction, hints and consolidation. Further, studies conducted so far show that there is significant relationship between mentioned patterns of behaviour and students' achievement (Bloom, 1976; Senemoğlu, 1987; Sönmez, 2008). Patterns of behaviour mentioned by students and attributed negative metaphors may be the source of hatred, fear and mistrust in education environments. There can be no mention of affection and mutual understanding in environments dominated by these. Yet, there is significant relationship between affection and achievement (Sönmez, 2007).

It can be said that there is significant relationship between metaphors used by university students and gender. While female students give weight to such metaphors as “*researcher, scientist*” etc., it is “*Everest peak, Kaf mountain*” for male students. There are significant gender wise differences in some positive and negative statements. In spite of these, a significant majority of both female and male students have positive outlook and use positive metaphors for teaching staff. Given this, teaching staff still enjoy a respectable status in Turkey despite some negative attributions. (Alacapınar, 2013).

The outcomes of this study suggests that in teaching training curricula weight must be given to learning-teaching methods and theories, effective communication with students, and teaching faculty members how to get to know their students in practice. In universities, weight and priority may be given to research and education rather than commercial ends. It may also be useful to periodically check teaching staff in regard to their psychological health. In order to obtain further and more reliable conclusions in this field there may be more comprehensive new studies and outcomes obtained may be used in the development of teacher training programmes.

References

Aksu, M. (1981). *"Biçimlendirme-yetiştirmeye dönük değerlendirilmenin okuldaki öğrenmeye etkisi"*. *Impact of formative evaluation on learning at school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Journal of Hacettepe University. Institute of Social Sciences Ankara.*

Alacapınar, F.G. (2011). İlköğretim öğrencileri "öğretmenlerini" nelere benzetmektedirler? What do primary school students liken their teachers to? *Journal of Konya Selçuk University Education Faculty, 32, 249-263.*

Alacapınar, F.G. (2013, September). *Öğretim üyesinin eğitim ortamında sergilediği davranışların öğrencide oluşturduğu duyuşsal tepkiler. Affective reactions of the student to the behaviour of teaching staff in education environments. Abant İzzet Baysal University 2. National Education Programmes and Teaching Congress, Bolu.*

Arslan, M. (1996). *Studying with underlined material and the impact of full learning method on the level of learning, recalling and the concept of personalization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences. Ankara.*

Bloom, B.S. (1976). *Human characteristics and school learning. New York: McGraw-Hill.*

Çelikten, M. (2006). *Kültür ve öğretmen metaforları. Metaphors on culture and teacher. Retrieved June 20, 2015 from <http://sbe.erciyes.edu.tr>.*

Çubukçu, Zuhâl. (2008, June). *İlköğretim ve ortaöğretimdeki öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin "öğretmen" kavramına ilişkin ileri sürdükleri metaforlar (Metaphors of students and teachers in primary and secondary education related to the concept of "teacher")*, Proceedings of International Conference on Educational Science, ICES'08, EMU, Famagusta-North-Cyprus.

Girmen, P. (2007). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin konuşma ve yazma sürecinde metafordan yararlanma durumları. (State of primary students in using metaphors in their speaking and writing processes). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Eskişehir AÜEBE.*

Kadunz, G.& Straber, R. (2004, July). *Image-metaphor-diagram: visualisation in learning mathematics. International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education, Bergen: Norway.*

Kapıcıoğlu, M. O. K. (2006). *Dizgeli öğretimin etkililiği (The effectiveness of systematic teaching). Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences.*

Ocak, G., Gündüz, M. (2008). *Eğitim fakültelerini yeni kazanan öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine giriş dersini almadan önce ve aldıktan sonra öğretmenlik mesleği hakkındaki metaforların karşılaştırılması (Comparison of metaphors related to the profession of teaching of freshmen students before and after their taking of the course "Introduction to the Profession of Teaching")*. Retrieved June 20, 2015 www.sosbil.aku.edu.tr/dergi/v11i2gocak-pdf.

Oxford English Dictionary (1996).

Özçelik, D. A. (1974). *Student involvement in the learning process*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago

Saban, A. (2004). Giriş düzeyindeki sınıf öğretmen adaylarının "öğretmen" kavramına ilişkin ileri sürdükleri metaforlar (Metaphors related to the concept of "teacher" of class teacher candidates at freshmen level). *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*. 2 (2), 131-135.

Saban, A., Koçbeker, B.N., Saban, A. (2005, September). *Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen kavramına ilişkin sahip oldukları metaforlar (Metaphors related to the concept of "teacher" of candidate teachers)*. XIV. National Congress of Educational Sciences, Denizli.

Senemoğlu, Nuray. (1987). *Bilişsel giriş davranışları ve dönüt düzeltmenin erişiyeye etkisi (Impact of cognitive behaviour and feedback correction on achievement)*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences.

Sönmez, V. (2007). *Sevgi eğitimi (Education in affection)*. Ankara: Anı

Sönmez, V. (2008). *Program geliştirmede öğretmen elkitabı (Teacher's guide in programme development)*. Ankara: Anı.

William, J.S.& Wake, G.D. (2004). *Metaphors and cultural models afford communication repairs of the breakdowns between mathematics discourses*. Retrieved July 20, 2015 form <http://www.emis.de/proceedings/PME28/RR/RR>.

Yıldıran, G. (1982). *Öğrenme düzeyi ve erişiyeye (Level of learning and achievement)*. İstanbul: Baha Matbaası.

Contact email: fusunmireli@yahoo.com