Schema Theory and Categorization of Student and Teacher Metaphors

Ebrahim Khodadady Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch, Mashhad, Iran Email: ekhodadady@um.ac.ir

Mostafa Morady Moghaddam Young Researchers Club, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

Hoda Kanan Azar Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch, Mashhad, Iran

Abstract—This study explored whether the metaphors written by 504 Iranian learners of English and 140 English teachers behaved like semantic features of the schemata they likened themselves to. The 239 student and 249 teacher metaphors elicited from the participants were submitted to four raters who assigned them to 13 conceptual categories established by Saban, Kocbeker, and Saban (2007). The statistical analysis of data showed that the categories behave as collective knowledge because there is no significant difference in the frequency of student metaphors written by both students and teachers who view students as passive recipients of knowledge, developing organisms and absolute compliants. Students and teachers, however, differ significantly as regards teacher categories. While the highest percentage of students metaphorised their teachers as facilitators/scaffolders, the teachers assigned a counselor's role to themselves, indicating that metaphors are sensitive to social positions. Since the categories are pretty stable over age, proficiency level, years and fields of study as well as experience, they reflect the ever-evolving nature of schema in the variety of metaphors with which the categories are depicted and thus reflect the reality of language learning and teaching in Iran.

Index Terms—Schema theory, semantic features, categories, individual and collective knowledge

I. INTRODUCTION

Burke (1945) defined metaphor as "a device for seeing something in terms of something else" (p. 503). However, Lakoff and Johnson (2005) extended it to acquiring the meaning of something according to another and Yazıcı (2010) gave it a synonymous function by demarcating it as using a word instead of another. In spite of being different in perspective, the explication of metaphor by these scholars shares the key terms "something" and "something else" referred to as *Topic* and *Vehicle* by Richards (1936) and Perrine (1971), respectively, for the first time (see Cameron, 1999).

In addition to the *Topic* and *Vehicle* of metaphors, Saban, Kocbeker, and Saban (2007) [henceforth SKS07] added the third element, i.e., *Ground*, to study 1142 prospective teachers' conceptions of teaching and learning. When filling out the sheet containing the prompt, "*A teacher is like ... because ...*" a female participant, for example, wrote, "*A teacher is like a gardener because s/he deals with different kinds of students like a gardener deals with different kinds of plants.*" The teacher, gardener and the reason or nature of relationship form the Topic, Vehicle and Ground of the metaphor, respectively.

The very addition of *Ground* as the third element of conceptual analysis helped SKS07 "break down each metaphor into analyzable parts, looking for salient features/ images, common elements, and similarities among the various metaphors" (p. 127). Their analysis of the responses given to the prompt resulted in establishing 10 main conceptual categories for teachers as shown in Table 1. When the metaphor *Book* is, for example, used as a vehicle by a metaphoriser to describe the metaphorised *Teacher* as a topic, his/her *Student* is regarded as a passive recipient of knowledge whose task is just absorbing whatever there is in the *Book*.

Significant other

Developing organism

Active participant in a community of practice

Constructor of knowledge

wledge

	SKS07'S SIXTY EXEMPLAR METAPHORS FOR TEN CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES OF TEACHERS									
#	Topic (Teacher)	Vehicle (Metaphor)	Ground (Student)							
1	Knowledge provider	Book, candle, computer, flower, fountain, jug, light, pen, rain, shopkeeper, spring, sun, television, tree, writer, poet	Passive recipient of kno							
2	Molder/craftsperson	Architect, baker, carpenter, constructor, cook, honeybee, ironworker, jeweler, mill, miner, painter, potter, sculptor, tailor, technician, weaver,	Raw material							
3	Curer/repairer	Doctor, mechanic, medicine	Defective individual							
4	Superior authoritative figure	Brain, locomotive, shepherd, ship captain	Absolute compliant							
5	Change agent	Fashion designer, scriptwriter	Object of change							
6	Entertainer	Actors, actresses, stand-up comedian	Conscious observant							

Chameleon, farmer, gardener, soil,

Coach, conductor, tour guide,

road map, taxi driver, torch, traffic signs

Companion, psychologist, friend, mother, father

Bridge, compass, flashlight, ladders, lighthouse, north star,

TABLE 1

The study of metaphors in terms of their topic, vehicle and ground is quite dehumanized and decontextualised because the terms topic, vehicle and ground have no reference to the metaphorisers as the sources of metaphors. For this very reason Yob (2003) believed that metaphors are employed when humans try to understand and address "something [italic added] esoteric, abstract, novel, or highly speculative. As a general rule, the more abstract or speculative it is, the greater the variety of metaphors needed to grapple with it" (p. 134). Yob's view stands in sharp contrast to Phillips (1996) who believed that a metaphor such as a gardener may help understand teachers but it may also act as a block to look for more promising perspectives.

This study takes a totally different approach towards studying metaphors by treating them as semantic features which reflect the ever evolving nature of a given schema such as a student and a teacher. They reflect language users' personal attitudes and feelings towards as well as experiences with the schema metaphorised. The schema *teacher*, for example, has many semantic features which relate to and distinguish it from other similar schemata such as *students* and *pupils* in a specific place at a given time.

Figure 1 presents some of the semantic features speakers have in their minds when they utter the schemata student and *teacher*. As can be seen, the first feature shows that teachers and students are human by nature. However, some language learners may not capitalize on this feature in their teachers and focus instead on their being resourceful and thus liken them to books and dictionaries. Others though may pay more attention to their teachers' caring role and liken them to fathers and wives. These lived and experienced semantic features of schemata do in fact distinguish them from words in that the definition of *teachers* and *students* as *words* in dictionaries lack many semantic features interlocutors usually associate with the schemata *teachers* and *students* in their every day verbal interactions.

Schemata	Human	Caring	Receiving	Initiating	Resourceful	Being paid	Being sought
Teacher	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Students	+		+	-	-	-	±

FIGURE 1. SEMANTIC FEATURES OF TEACHERS AND STUDENTS AS SCHEMATA

The term schema was first used by Khodadady (1997, 1999) and Khodadady and Herriman (2000) to demarcate a word or phrase produced by an addresser to represent a real entity such as a teacher in combination with other words/phrases comprising a text. Khodadady, Pishghadam, and Fakhar (2010), for example, classified schemata comprising certain units of three textbooks taught at an intermediate level of language proficiency into three domains, i.e., semantic, syntactic and parasyntactic, to study the relationship among reading comprehension ability, grammar and vocabulary knowledge. As did Khodadady, Shirmohammadi, and Talebi, (2011) to study brainstorming and its effect on critical thinking and speaking skills. While semantic schemata such as nouns are many in type but few in their frequency, the syntactic schemata such as pronouns are few in type but many in frequency. Parasyntactic schemata such as names may be many in both type and frequency but always play a syntactic role in language comprehension and production.

The first evidence supporting the treatment of metaphors as semantic features of schemata comes from their belonging to one specific domain, i.e., semantic. As can be seen in Table 1, all teacher metaphors employed by SKS07's participants are nouns and belong only to semantic domain in that they are open or many in type. Secondly, they are hierarchical in the sense that many metaphors can be subsumed under a single category. And finally, they are personal and reflect metaphorisers' individualistic experiences with the schema they metaphorise and thus differentiate them from words as abstract units of language.

If metaphors behave like the semantic features of a given schema, as it is claimed in this study, they must represent not only collective knowledge but also individual experiences of the metaphorisers with the schema under investigation. In other words, as the collective knowledge of a given schema, the categories into which the metaphors of that schema are subsumed should not be significantly different for given groups of metaphorisers, i.e., students and teachers in this

8

9

10

Counselor

Nurturer/cultivator

Facilitator/scaffolder

Cooperative/democratic leader

study. As indicators of individual experiences, the categories of metaphors must, however, differ significantly not only from a given group, i.e., teachers, to another group, i.e., students, but also from metaphor to metaphor because their status or social positions provide them with different experiences. This study is, therefore, designed to test these assumptions.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

Three groups of people took part in this study, i.e., English learners and teachers in private institutes and four raters majoring in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad.

English Language Learners

Two hundred seventy three (54.2%) female and 231 (45.8%) male learners of English took part voluntarily in the project. One hundred ninety six (38.9%), 139 (27.6%), 85 (16.9%) and 84 (16.7%) were studying at Rayehe Danesh, Iran language Institutes, Meraj Andishe and Shokuh, respectively. Their age ranged from 10 to 50 (mean = 18.62, SD = 5.34) and they all spoke Persian as their mother language. Table 2 shows the frequency (F), percent (P) and cumulative percent (CP) of the number of years (Y) the 504 participants had spent learning English. As can be seen it ranged from one to 18 years (mean = 3.71, SD = 1.97).

TABLE 2
THE NUMBER OF YEARS SPENT ON STUDYING ENGLISH (Y) AND THEIR FREQUENCY (F), PERCENT (P) AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT (CP)

Y	F	Р	СР	Y	F	Р	СР	Y	F	Р	СР
1	25	5.0	5.0	6	21	4.2	91.7	11	1	.2	99.6
2	123	24.4	29.4	7	13	2.6	94.2	12	1	.2	99.8
3	138	27.4	56.7	8	17	3.4	97.6	18	1	.2	100.0
4	72	14.3	71.0	9	4	.8	98.4	Total	504	100.0	
5	83	16.5	87.5	10	5	1.0	99.4				

English Language Teachers

In addition to 504 learners of English, 140 teachers, 78 female (55.7%) and 62 male (44.3), took part in the study voluntarily. Their age ranged from 18 to 50 (mean = 26.7, SD = 5.47). They were either studying for or held a degree in English Language and Literature (n= 47, % = 33.6), Teaching English as a Foreign Language (n= 44, % = 31.4), English Translation (n= 35, % = 25). (Fourteen teachers (10%) did not, however, specify their field of study.)

Their experience in teaching English ranged from one to 22 years (mean = 3.9, SD = 3.35). They were teaching at Bayan (n = 24, % = 17%), Iran Language Institute (n = 32, % = 22.9%), Meraj Andishe (n = 28, % = 20%), Rayehe Danesh (n = 28, % = 20%), and Shokuh (n = 28, % = 20%) institutes when the research was conducted. They all spoke Persian as their mother language.

Four Raters

The present male researchers categorized the metaphors in consultation with each other as rater 1. The metaphors along with the rater 1's categories taken from the topic and ground columns of Table 1 as well as SKS07's examples were then sent separately to two female and one male raters who were doing their graduate studies at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. They were asked to decide independently which category each metaphor belonged to. The raters had all taught general English at various private and public language schools for more than five years.

B. Instrument

The instrument used in the study was a questionnaire consisting of two parts: While the biodata section differed for the students and teachers, the prompts were the same. In the biodata section the learners were asked to specify their gender, age, years of studying English and the name of the institute they were attending when they took part in the project whereas the teachers were to specify their field of study and years of teaching English along with their gender and age. The second part consisted of two prompts for both the learners and teachers. First, the question, "What is your idea about a student?" was asked. Then the incomplete sentence, "A student is like" was given to be completed. Similarly, for the second prompt the question "What is your idea about a teacher?" was raised first and the incomplete sentence, "A teacher is like" was given immediately to be completed.

C. Procedure

The researchers attended the institutes in person and invited both the teachers and learners to participate in the study. Upon their agreement the questionnaire was administered on the spot and in the case of the teachers having no extra time, another session was set to have their students fill it out. The researchers then went back to the same teacher on the specified date and distributed the questionnaire either in their teachers' presence or alone.

After 240 and 245 metaphors written for English students and teachers, respectively, were specified, they were alphabetically ordered and the two male researchers of this study established their categories by frequently consulting and discussing Table 1 and the examples provided by SKS07. The researchers' ratings were specified as Rater 1 and then the metaphors and rated categories along with SK0S's examples were sent to a female graduate of TEFL to

categorize the teacher and student metaphors separately as Rater 2. She was also asked to explain why she disagreed with Rater 1 whenever she categorized a given metaphor differently.

A comparison of Rater 1 and 2's categories showed that they agreed neither on student nor on teacher metaphors at the required level, i.e., .90 or higher (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Out of 240 student metaphors they agreed on 182, i.e., 182/240=.76. Similarly, the agreement coefficient for teacher metaphors was .80, i.e., 198/245. The metaphor *Cigarette*, for example, was categorized as *Defective Individual* by Rater 1. Rater 2, however, categorized it as *Facilitator/scaffolder* because

At first glance, I see no association between cigarette and teacher. Cigarette is usually associated with destruction, fatality and disease. But viewing from another perspective, *while not justified and acceptable for me* [italics are added], some smokers believe it is soothing and it facilitates their control over anger or stress or even regulates their temper!

In spite of being *not justified and acceptable* for Rater 2, she had, nonetheless, categorized Cigarette as *Facilitator/scaffolder*. In order to reach the acceptable level of agreement, Rater 1's categories along with SKS07's examples were, therefore, sent to male Rater 3. Since most of Rater 3's categorization was the same as Rater 1's, they were treated as cases of agreement and Rater 2's categories were discarded wherever it disagreed with a given metaphor assigned to the same category by both Rater 1 and 3. In some cases, Rater 3's categories, however, agreed with Rater 2's though he had no access to her ratings. In such cases, Rater 1's categorized it as *Change Agent*. The adopting of this procedure increased the agreement to the acceptable level of .96 (231/240) for student metaphors and .97 (238/245) for teachers.

Since all the elicited metaphors were going to be analyzed in this study, the few metaphors upon which the three raters disagreed were changed into a three-choice item test and sent to another female Rater along with SKS07's examples. She was told that the three alternatives presented for each metaphor were categorized by three different raters. She was asked to read the examples very carefully and choose the alternative which best fit her own experiences with English students as well teachers as shown in the directions and example given below:

Dear Rater:

Would you please read the attached file containing example sentences for metaphor categories very carefully and then based on your personal experiences with both English students and teachers, specify which alternative provides the best description for a **teacher** likened to an object such as a **Book**. A colleague of yours chose C, *Knowledge provider*, as the best alternative.

Example: A **teacher** likened to a **Book** is like a ... A Change agent B Facilitator/scaffolder C Knowledge provider *

The selections made by rater four were adopted as the category upon which 100 percent agreements were reached and thus no metaphor was discarded from the study. This approach resulted in establishing more categories for both student and teacher metaphors as will be discussed shortly.

D. Data Analysis

All the metaphors produced by both English teachers and students were arranged alphabetically and assigned to categories established by SKS07 and extended further in this study. While SKS07 identified only 10 categories for teachers, for example, the four raters of this study added *Absolute compliant*, *Active participant*, *Change object* and *Defective individual* to the list, too. Similarly, the students were assigned to 13 categories on the basis of the examples SKS07 had given in their study. The reliability of these categories was then determined by subjecting them to inter rater analyses to reach 100 percent agreement by employing four raters. And finally, the categories were analyzed statistically by employing Crosstabs and Chi-Square test to explore the following six null hypotheses.

H1There is no significant difference in the student categories metaphorised by students of varying age, gender, and years of study

H2 There is no significant difference in the teacher categories metaphorised by students of varying age, gender, years of study

H3There is no significant difference in the student categories metaphorised by teachers of varying field of study, age, gender, and years of teaching.

H4There is no significant difference in the teachers categories metaphorised by teachers of varying fields of study, age, gender, and years of teaching.

H5 There is no significant difference in the student categories metaphorised by teachers and students themselves H6 There is no significant difference in the teacher categories metaphorised by students and teachers themselves

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3 presents the number of metaphors written by students and teachers. As it can be seen, both students and teachers wrote 239 and 245 metaphors for students and teachers, respectively. (Appendices A and B provide all the metaphors along with their categories and frequencies.) The number of teacher metaphors, i.e., 167 (68.2%), written by the students is higher than those they wrote for themselves, i.e., 141 (59%). However, the number of student metaphors

indicating that they shared more common views regarding students metaphors.							
TABLE 3							
THE NUMBER OF METAPHORS WRITTEN BY STUDENTS AND TEACHERS							

written by both students and teachers, i.e., 77 (32.2%) was higher than that of teacher metaphors, i.e., 53 (21.6%),

Metaphoriser	N	Student Metaphor		Teacher Metaphor		
	IN	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Students (Ss)	504	141	59.0	167	68.2	
Teachers (Ts)	140	21	8.8	25	10.2	
Both Ss and Ts	644	77	32.2	53	21.6	
Total		239	100.0	245	100.0	

Table 4 presents the 13 student categories metaphorised by students of varying age, gender, and years of study. As can be seen, the frequency of categories is of almost the same number for teens and adults, females and males and freshman and senior learners of English. Most of them, for example, consider themselves as passive recipients of knowledge, developing organisms and absolute compliants. The Chi-Square analysis of these frequencies thus confirmed the first hypothesis that *there is no significant difference in the student categories metaphorised by students of varying age, gender, and years of study,* implying that the schema of *student*, for example, invokes the image of certain objects in the minds of students of all ages, gender and proficiency level to reflect their being as empty as *bags, banks*, and *baskets* to be filled by teachers.

THE STUDENT CATEGORIES METAPHORISED BY STUDENTS									
	Age Grou	ւթ	Gende	r	Years of Study				
Metaphor Category	10 to 18	19 and higher	F	М	Freshman and sophomore	Junior and senior			
Passive recipient	84	86	90	80	90	80			
Developing organism	47	46	51	42	58	35			
Absolute compliant	40	30	43	27	44	26			
Active participant	24	15	21	18	26	13			
Defective individual	18	11	13	16	20	9			
Raw material	18	21	19	20	19	20			
Constructor of knowledge	15	10	16	9	13	12			
Molder/craftsperson	5	4	5	4	3	6			
Significant other	5	6	6	5	3	8			
Conscious observant	4	7	6	5	7	4			
Superior authoritative figure	2	4	2	4	1	5			
Nurturer/cultivator	0	1	0	1	1	0			
Object of change	0	1	1	0	1	0			
	262	242	273	231	286	218			

TABLE 4 The student categories metaphorised by students

Khodadady (1997) suggested that a given *word* such as a *student* which is produced by a writer in a given context such as the first prompt of this study, i.e., *a student is like* ..., be treated as a *schema* because it embodies a large number of closely related concepts, i.e., metaphors, which relate it to the writer's personal experiences with the same schema in other real contexts where the metaphors are employed non-metaphorically. Viewing the metaphorised *student* as a *schema*, for example, explains why 46 different metaphors have been written by the students themselves to show their own personal experiences, and consequent identification, with the metaphors such as *bags* and *baskets* as they have experienced committing vocabulary to their memories as real containers at home. (Appendix A provides a complete list of these metaphors.) While the *word* student exists only in dictionaries and can *never* embody metaphors elicited in this study as parts of their static definition, the *schema* student does accomplish the task in the variety of metaphors produced in this study.

Table 5 presents the teacher categories metaphorised by students of varying age, gender, and years of study. As can be seen, most learners view their teachers as *facilitators*, *knowledge providers* and *counselors*. The Chi-Square analysis run on the frequency of all teacher categories confirmed the second hypothesis that *there is no significant difference in the teacher categories metaphorised by students of varying age, gender, years of study*. These results indicate that similar to the schema of *student*, the schema of *teacher* evolves steadily over age, gender and years of study and thus provides further support for Khodadady and Elahi's (2012) argument that schemata are collective knowledge acquired personally through different experiences.

	Age Grou	n	Gender Year of Study							
Metaphor Category	ategory 10 to 18 19 and higher F M Freshman and sophomore		Freshman and sophomore	Junior and senior						
Facilitator/scaffolder	61	76	75	62	81	56				
Knowledge provider	60	57	67	50	63	54				
Counselor	44	37	42	39	49	32				
Nurturer/cultivator	26	21	19	28	26	21				
Cooperative/democratic leader	18	16	19	15	18	16				
Superior authoritative figure	15	8	13	10	17	6				
Entertainer	13	7	12	8	11	9				
Curer/repairer	10	3	6	7	10	3				
Molder/craftsperson	9	13	15	7	7	15				
Absolute compliant	3	0	0	3	3	0				
Change agent	3	0	2	1	0	3				
Active participant	0	1	1	0	0	1				
Defective individual	0	3	2	1	1	2				
Total	262	242	273	231	286	218				

TABLE 5

The teacher schema, for example, activates the mental images of objects such as chairs, guns, windows, beds, buses, cameras, carpets, and heaters in the minds of students and they employ these images consciously as metaphors to depict their English teachers' role in their language learning. The personal experiences of the highest number of student participants in this study with facilitating humans such as workers and detectives, locations such as classrooms and boulevards, and objects such as erasers and heaters have provided them with metaphors to liken their teachers to. Similarly, the second largest percentage views their teachers as *trees* and *mountains* because as real plants and locations, they have provided the students with their required types of fruit and landscape, respectively, as their teachers have provided them with English knowledge in a similar manner.

The findings presented in Table 5 also indicate that the learners assign their evolving schemata into more comprehensive categories to show their collective knowledge of metaphorised schemata such as students and teachers. The metaphors themselves, however, show how the students view the collective knowledge of the same schema personally. This very unique feature of schema explains why 68 metaphors have been written by the students alone to reveal the *facilitative* role of their teachers. One of them, for example, has employed the Persian slang metaphor *Anorak*, i.e., a person with a strong interest in niche subjects, to depict her teacher's facilitative role in helping her acquire proficiency in English as a niche language.

Table 6 presents the 12 student categories metaphorised by teachers of varying age, field of study, gender and teaching years. As can be seen, the frequency of categories is almost the same in each category indicating that the majority of young and adult, female and male, less and more experienced teachers look at their students as passive recipients. The Chi-square analysis of frequencies did not show any significant difference among categories and thus confirmed the third hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the student categories metaphorised by teachers of varying field of study, age, gender, and years of teaching.

THE STUDENT CATEGORIES METAPHORISED BY TEACHERS										
	Age Group		Field of study*				Gender		Teaching years	
Categories	18 to 25	26 and older	1	2	3	4	F	М	1 to 3.5	4 and more
Passive recipient	23	18	17	12	3	9	22	19	24	17
Developing organism	11	16	11	7	4	5	11	16	21	6
Absolute compliant	9	12	5	5	3	8	12	9	13	8
Raw material	5	6	2	5	2	2	4	7	8	3
Active participant	4	6	3	4	2	1	7	3	4	6
Conscious observant	4	1	1	2	0	2	5	0	4	1
Constructor of knowledge	4	6	3	5	0	2	7	3	7	3
Defective individual	3	5	3	2	0	3	5	3	3	5
Knowledge provider	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Molder/craftsperson	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Significant other	1	2	1	1	0	1	3	0	2	1
Superior authoritative figure	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Total	66	74	47	44	14	35	78	62	89	51

TABLE 6

* (1) LITERATURE, (2) METHODOLOGY, (3) OTHER, AND (4) TRANSLATION

Table 7 presents the 11 teacher categories metaphorised by teachers of varying age, field of study, gender and teaching years. As can be seen, the frequency is similar in each category for the teacher participants. The majority of young and adult, female and male and less and more experienced teachers with degrees in four different fields look at themselves as counselors, facilitators, cooperative leaders and nurturers. The Chi-square analysis of frequencies did not show any significant difference among the categories and thus *confirmed* the fourth hypothesis that *there is no* significant difference in the teachers categories metaphorised by teachers of varying fields of study, age, gender, and years of teaching.

THE TEACHER CATEGORIES METAPHORISED BY TEACHERS										
	Age Grou	р	Field of Study*				Sex		Teaching years	
Categories	18 to 25	26 and older	1	2	3	4	F	М	1 to 2.5	3.5 and more
Counselor	12	17	13	8	3	5	14	15	9	14
Facilitator/scaffolder	12	11	4	8	3	8	15	8	11	5
Cooperative/democratic leader	10	10	7	7	2	4	11	9	13	4
Nurturer/cultivator	10	9	9	2	2	6	6	13	4	9
Knowledge provider	8	7	2	6	2	5	10	5	6	7
Molder/craftsperson	7	10	5	7	1	4	9	8	3	8
Superior authoritative figure	4	2	3	3	0	0	4	2	2	2
Absolute compliant	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Change agent	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
Entertainer	1	6	1	3	0	3	7	0	1	4
Defective individual	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
	66	74	47	44	14	35	78	62	51	55

 TABLE 7

 The teacher categories metaphorised by teachers

* (1) LITERATURE, (2) METHODOLOGY, (3) OTHER, AND (4) TRANSLATION

Table 8 presents the 14 categories into which the metaphors written by students and teachers have been assigned by the four raters. As can be seen, there is almost a perfect agreement regarding what categories the majority of students fall from both students and teachers' perspective. Since the frequency of metaphors written by both groups is almost the same, the Chi-square test thus *confirmed* the fifth hypothesis postulating the lack of significant difference as regards what both teachers and students liken the students' role in learning English.

TABLE 8
STUDENT CATEGORIES METAPHORISED BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS THEMSELVES

	Metaphoriser				Cumulative
Metaphor Categories	Student	Teacher	Total	Percent	percent
Passive recipient	170	41	211	32.8	32.8
Developing organism	93	27	120	18.6	51.4
Absolute compliant	70	21	91	14.1	65.5
Raw material	39	11	50	7.8	73.3
Active participant	39	10	49	7.6	80.9
Defective individual	29	8	37	5.7	86.6
Constructor of knowledge	25	10	35	5.4	92.1
Conscious observant	11	5	16	2.5	94.6
Significant other	11	3	14	2.2	96.7
Molder/craftsperson	9	2	11	1.7	98.4
Superior authoritative figure	6	1	7	1.1	99.5
Nurturer/cultivator	1	0	1	.2	99.8
Object of change	1	0	1	.2	99.7
Knowledge provider	0	1	1	.2	100.0
	504	140	644		

The results presented in Table 8 support the argument made in this study that *metaphors provide the most factual and experiential data through which a given society's collective as well as personal understanding of its key members such as students and teachers can be assessed.* They do, for example, indicate that almost 75% of students have no choice but play the role of *passive recipients, developing organisms, absolute compliants* and *raw materials* in a context where the language they learn has no communicative role to play. In other words, the inability of Iranian learners to employ their English for real purposes as molders, for example, do, leave them with no other choice. However, 7.6% of these learners do manage to learn English as active participants.

Table 9 presents the teacher categories metaphorised by students and teachers themselves. As can be seen, while the highest percentage of students (27.2%) metaphorised their teachers as *facilitators/scaffolders*, the highest percentage of teachers (20.7%) assigned a *counselor's* role to themselves. Similarly, the second highest percentage of students and teachers see teachers differently, i.e., *knowledge providers* (23.2%) and *facilitators/scaffolders* (16.4%), respectively. The Chi-square analysis of category frequencies showed that they were significantly different, i.e. $\chi^2 = 40.351$, df = 12, p <.0001, and thus *disconfirmed* the sixth hypothesis *that there is no significant difference in the teacher categories metaphorised by students and teachers themselves*.

2524	

	Student	;		Teach	er		Total
Metaphor category	F	Р	СР	F	Р	СР	F
Facilitator/scaffolder	137	27.2	27.2	23	16.4	37.1	160
Knowledge provider	117	23.2	50.4	15	10.7	87.9	132
Counselor	81	16.1	66.5	29	20.7	20.7	110
Nurturer/cultivator	47	9.3	75.8	19	13.6	65.0	66
Cooperative/democratic leader	34	6.7	82.5	20	14.3	51.4	54
Superior authoritative figure	23	4.6	87.1	6	4.3	97.1	29
Molder/craftsperson	22	4.4	91.5	17	12.1	77.1	39
Entertainer	20	4.0	95.4	7	5.0	92.9	27
Curer/repairer	13	2.6	98.0	0	-	-	13
Absolute compliant	3	.6	98.6	1	.7	99.3	4
Change agent	3	.6	99.2	1	.7	100.0	4
Defective individual	3	.6	99.8	2	1.4	98.6	5
Active participant	1	.2	100.0	0	-	-	1
	504	100		140	100		644

 TABLE 9

 TEACHER CATEGORIES METAPHORISED BY STUDENTS AND TEACHERS THEMSELVES

IV. CONCLUSION

This study was designed to find out whether the metaphors language learners and teachers are likened to behave like semantic features through which the metaphorised schemata, i.e., students and teachers, were viewed under the conditions determining English learning in Iran in 2011. It was found that the majority of both students and teachers view learners as *passive recipients*, *developing organisms* and *absolute complaints*. In other words students and teachers of all ages, gender, years of study/teaching and the field of study regard English learners as passive and developing recipients of knowledge who comply with the rules set by their society. It was argued that the categories assigned are natural within a foreign language context because the very lack of authentic interlocutors, i.e., English speakers, with whom they can actively communicate and thus become active participants makes learning the language receptive, i.e., passive, rather than productive, i.e., active.

Students and teachers, however, have significantly different views as regards teachers' roles. While the highest percentage of English learners assign a *facilitating role* to their teachers by likening them to objects such as chairs and windows, the highest percentage of teachers give themselves a *counseling* role and liken themselves to friends and hearers. Students also assign the two roles of curers and active participants to teachers while the teachers do not see themselves in those roles, indicating that there is a discrepancy as regards what educational roles English teachers play in Iran. It is, therefore, suggested a more in-depth schema-based analysis of teachers be conducted by having the teachers articulate what they liken themselves and their students to and why. Their explicit metaphors and explanations must show why the second highest percentage of students views teachers as knowledge providers whereas teachers assign a facilitator's role to themselves.

And finally, treating metaphors as semantic features of the metaphorised schemata such as students and teachers reflect their pragmatic definitions within the variables of place and time and accomplish the task many authorities in language education strive to capture theoretically. In communicative Language Teaching, for example, several roles are assigned to teachers, e.g., needs analysts, counselors and group process managers (Richards & Rodger, 2001). The metaphors elicited in this study, however, show that what some teaching experts theorise about teachers' roles hardly reflects the reality in Iranian language classes and results in a significant difference in what teachers think they are and what their students liken them to.

APPENDIX A

239 student metaphors produced by students and teachers (MV (Metaphoriser values): 1=students, 2=teachers, 3=students and teachers, CV (Category values): 1=Absolute compliant, 2 =Active participant, 3 =Conscious observant, 4=Constructor of knowledge, 5=Defective individual, 6=Developing organism, 7=Facilitator/scaffolder, 8=Knowledge provider, 9=Molder/craftsperson, 10=Nurturer/cultivator, 11=Object of change, 12=Passive recipient, 13=Raw material, 14=Significant other, 15=Superior authoritative figure

ST: Student token or the number of times the metaphor is produced by students; TT: Teacher token or the number of times the metaphor is produced by teachers)

No	MV	Student Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum	No	MV	Student Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum
1	1	Belt	1	1	0	1	35	3	Waiter	1	1	0	1
2	1	Bench	1	1	0	1	36	2	Watch	1	1	1	2
3	1	Bicycle	1	1	0	1	37	2	Wave	1	2	1	3
4	1	Bus	1	1	0	1	38	3	Wheel	1	0	1	1
5	1	Carpet	1	1	0	1	39	1	Үоуо	1	2	0	2
6	3	Employer	1	1	0	1	40	3	Ball	2	5	2	7
7	1	Fish	1	3	0	3	41	2	Adventurer	2	0	1	1
8	1	Floor	1	3	0	3	42	1	Artist	2	4	0	4
9	1	Handkerchief	1	3	1	4	43	1	Athlete	2	1	0	1
10	1	Hen	1	2	1	3	44	1	Buyer	2	1	0	1
11	3	Horse	1	3	0	3	45	1	Dancer	2	1	0	1
12	1	Key	1	4	1	5	46	1	Doctor	2	2	1	3
13	1	Keyboard	1	1	0	1	47	3	Driver	2	1	0	1
14	1	Kite	1	1	0	1	48	3	Explorer	2	0	1	1
15	1	Knife	1	1	0	1	49	1	Fan	2	1	0	1
16	1	Machine	1	1	0	1	50	3	Heart	2	1	0	1
17	1	Marker	1	4	0	4	51	1	Leader	2	1	0	1
18	1	Media player	1	0	1	1	52	1	Lover	2	3	3	6
19	3	Money	1	6	2	8	53	3	Perfume	2	1	1	2
20	3	Plane	1	1	1	2	54	3	Processor	2	2	0	2
21	1	Police	1	0	1	1	55	3	Risk taker	2	5	3	8
22	1	Poster	1	1	0	1	56	1	Speaker	2	1	0	1
23	1	Programme	1	2	0	1	57	3	Swimmer	2	1	1	2
24	1	Road	1	2	1	3	58	3	Taxi driver	2	3	2	5
25	3	Robot	1	4	0	4	59	3	Teacher	2	1	0	1
26	3	Ruler	1	2	0	2	60	1	Teeth	2	1	1	2
27	1	Scissors	1	1	0	1	61	1	Tour	2	1	0	1
28	2	Sheep	1	2	1	3	62	1	Tourist	2	1	0	1
29	3	Software	1	2	0	2	63	3	Clown	3	1	1	2
30	3	Soldier	1	1	2	3	64	1	Eagle	3	1	0	1
31	2	Tire	1	5	0	5	65	1	Eye	3	2	1	3
32	1	Train	1	2	0	2	66	1	Owl	3	1	1	2
33	2	Training dog	1	1	0	1	67	3	Player	3	3	1	4
34	1	Typewriter	1	1	0	1	68	1	Singer	3	5	1	6

Appendix A (Continued)

No	MV	Student Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum	No	MV	Student Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum
69	1	Wrestler	3	7	0	7	104	1	Virus	5	1	0	1
70	1	Ant	4	1	0	1	105	1	Volcano	5	1	0	1
71	2	Bee	4	0	1	1	106	3	Baby	6	24	7	31
72	2	Computer program	4	14	2	16	107	3	Bird	6	6	3	9
73	3	Discoverer	4	1	0	1	108	1	Butterfly	6	2	0	2
74	1	Door	4	2	0	2	109	1	Cat	6	1	0	1
75	1	Dream	4	1	1	2	110	3	Child	6	12	5	17
76	1	Engine	4	2	1	3	111	3	Cloud	6	4	1	5
77	1	Fire	4	1	0	1	112	1	Dog	6	1	0	1
78	1	Glasses	4	1	0	1	113	1	Donkey	6	3	0	3
79	1	Mountain climber	4	4	0	4	114	1	Drop of water	6	6	1	7
80	3	Operator	4	0	1	1	115	1	Elephant	6	1	0	1
81	1	Producer	4	2	1	3	116	3	Field	6	2	0	2
82	3	Researcher	4	2	0	2	117	1	Finger	6	2	1	3
83	3	Runner	4	1	1	2	118	3	Flower	6	1	0	1
84	1	Sailor	4	5	2	7	119	2	Fresh flower	6	21	3	24
85	3	Technician	4	1	0	1	120	3	Fruit	6	5	3	8
86	1	Criminal	5	3	1	4	121	3	Kid	6	1	0	1
87	1	Deadlock	5	2	0	2	122	3	Pet	6	3	1	4
88	3	Desert	5	1	0	1	123	1	Question mark	6	1	0	1
89	2	Error	5	1	0	1	124	3	Seed	6	1	0	1
90	1	Liar	5	1	0	1	125	2	Writer	8	12	2	14
91	3	Patient	5	5	1	6	126	3	Creator	9	0	1	1
92	1	Pick pocket	5	5	2	7	127	1	Engineer	9	1	0	1
93	1	Prisoner	5	2	0	2	128	3	Inventor	9	4	0	4
94	1	Rubbish	5	1	0	1	129	1	Gardener	10	2	0	2
95	1	Spider	5	1	0	1	130	1	Clothes	11	1	0	1
96	1	Spy	5	1	0	1	131	1	Bag	12	1	0	1
97	2	Stick	5	3	0	3	132	1	Bank	12	1	0	1
98	3	Storm	5	0	1	1	133	1	Basket	12	1	0	1
99	3	Sweet	5	2	1	3	134	1	Battery	12	1	0	1
100	1	Tear	5	1	1	2	135	2	Blank page	12	0	1	1

101	1	Thief	5	1	0	1	136	1	Board	12	1	0	1
102	1	Trouble maker	5	6	3	9	137	3	Boat	12	2	1	3
103	3	Turtle	5	1	0	1	138	1	Book	12	1	0	1

Appendix A (Continued)

No	MV	Student Metaphor	CV	ST	ТТ	Sum	No	MV	Student Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum
139	1	Bookshelf	12	1	0	1	176	2	Oak	12	0	1	1
140	1	Bottle	12	1	0	1	177	1	Page	12	2	0	2
141	1	Briefcase	12	1	0	1	178	3	Paper	12	1	0	1
142	2	Cabinet	12	0	1	1	179	3	Parrot	12	1	1	2
143	1	Calendar	12	1	0	1	180	3	Passenger	12	7	3	10
144	1	Camel	12	1	0	1	181	3	Pen	12	0	1	1
145	1	Camera	12	1	0	1	182	3	Pencil	12	8	1	9
146	1	Candle	12	1	0	1	183	3	Picture	12	1	0	1
147	3	Car	12	12	2	14	184	3	Plant	12	2	1	3
148	3	Cassette player	12	1	1	2	185	2	Pocket dictionary	12	2	4	6
149	1	CD	12	1	0	1	186	1	Pool	12	1	0	1
150	1	Cell phone	12	3	0	3	187	1	Rain	12	1	0	1
151	1	Chair	12	1	0	1	188	3	Receiver	12	4	0	4
152	3	Clock	12	3	1	4	189	1	Recorder	12	3	1	4
153	1	Colors	12	1	0	1	190	1	Room	12	1	1	2
154	3	Computer	12	1	0	1	191	1	Skin	12	2	0	2
155	1	Cup	12	1	0	1	192	3	Sky	12	1	0	1
156	1	Dictionary	12	2	1	3	193	1	Song	12	21	3	24
157	3	Dish	12	1	1	2	194	1	Star	12	1	0	1
158	1	Envelop	12	2	0	2	195	3	Tape recorder	12	1	1	2
159	1	Garden	12	4	1	5	196	1	Theatre	12	1	0	1
160	3	Goalkeeper	12	2	0	2	197	1	Tomb	12	0	1	1
161	1	Hard worker	12	1	0	1	198	3	Tree	12	0	1	1
162	1	House	12	2	1	3	199	1	TV	12	1	1	2
163	1	Ink	12	1	0	1	200	1	Vase	12	1	0	1
164	1	Kitchen	12	1	2	3	201	3	Wall	12	2	1	3
165	1	Library	12	2	0	2	202	1	Whiteboard	12	1	1	2
166	1	Light	12	2	0	2	203	1	Wood	12	0	1	1
167	2	Lighter	12	2	0	2	204	3	Worker	12	3	0	3
168	3	Listener	12	2	1	3	205	1	Air	13	1	0	1
169	3	Mirror	12	1	0	1	206	1	Brick	13	1	0	1
170	1	Monkey	12	1	1	2	207	3	Brush	13	1	1	2
171	1	Moon	12	2	0	2	208	3	Cake	13	1	1	2
172	1	Nest	12	1	1	2	209	1	Chalk	13	1	0	1
173	1	Newspaper	12	1	0	1	210	3	Chocolate	13	1	1	2
174	1	Night	12	1	0	1	211	3	Clay	13	1	1	2
175	2	Notebook	12	1	0	1	212	1	Cucumber	13	1	0	1

Appendix A (Continued)

No	MV	Student Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum	No	MV	Student Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum
213	3	Dough	13	1	0	1	228	1	Salad	13	1	0	1
214	1	Egg	13	1	0	1	229	1	Salt	13	1	0	1
215	1	Gold	13	1	1	2	230	1	Sheet	13	0	2	2
216	1	Grape	13	2	0	2	231	3	Shoe	13	2	0	2
217	2	Grass	13	1	0	1	232	1	Socks	13	2	1	3
218	1	Gum	13	0	1	1	233	1	Tea	13	1	1	2
219	3	Gun	13	1	0	1	234	3	Water	13	0	1	1
220	1	Honey	13	1	0	1	235	1	Angel	14	5	0	5
221	1	Lemon	13	2	0	2	236	1	Bride	14	1	0	1
222	2	Meat	13	1	0	1	237	3	Friend	14	0	1	1
223	1	Metal	13	1	0	1	238	3	Lion	15	0	1	1
224	3	Nail	13	1	0	1	239	1	Manager	15	1	0	1
225	1	Pajamas	13	1	0	1			Total		503	139	641
226	2	Peach	13	3	2	5							
227	1	Pop corn	13	1	0	1							

APPENDIX B

245 teacher metaphors produced by students and teachers themselves (MV (Metaphoriser values): 1=students, 2= teachers, 3= students and teachers; CV (Category values): 1 = Absolute compliant, 2 = Active participant, 3 = Change agent, 4 = Cooperative/democratic leader, 5 = Counselor, 6 = Curer/repairer, 7 = Defective individual, 8 = Entertainer, 9

No	MV	Teacher Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum	No	MV	Teacher Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum
1	3	Soldier	1	1	1	2	31	1	Nurse	6	3	0	3
2	1	Student	1	1	0	1	32	1	Mechanic	6	1	0	1
3	1	Swimmer	2	1	0	1	33	1	Pill	6	1	0	1
4	1	Autumn	3	1	0	1	34	1	Placebo	6	1	0	1
5	3	Dream maker	3	1	1	2	35	1	Tranquilizer	6	1	0	1
6	1	Editor	3	1	0	1	36	1	Trash can	6	1	0	1
7	3	Guide	4	9	2	11	37	1	Cigarette	7	1	0	1
8	3	Leader	4	8	3	11	38	1	Neglect	7	1	0	1
9	3	Manager	4	5	5	10	39	1	Stranger	7	1	0	1
10	3	Coach	4	4	3	7	40	2	Beggar	7	0	1	1
11	3	Director	4	4	2	6	41	2	Turtle	7	0	1	1
12	3	Referee	4	2	1	3	42	3	Magician	8	4	2	6
13	1	Dish washer	4	1	0	1	43	3	Player	8	4	2	6
14	3	Tour guide	4	1	4	5	44	1	Music	8	2	0	2
15	3	Father	5	22	5	27	45	1	Beach	8	1	0	1
16	3	Mother	5	18	5	23	46	1	Butterfly	8	1	0	1
17	3	Friend	5	14	6	20	47	1	Cinema	8	1	0	1
18	3	Parent	5	5	4	9	48	3	Clown	8	1	2	3
19	1	Sister	5	5	0	5	49	1	Entertainer	8	1	0	1
20	3	Counselor	5	4	3	7	50	1	Film	8	1	0	1
21	3	Psychologist	5	4	2	6	51	1	Musician	8	1	0	1
22	1	Angel	5	3	0	3	52	1	Picnic	8	1	0	1
23	1	Brother	5	2	0	2	53	1	Soap opera	8	1	0	1
24	3	Mirror	5	2	1	3	54	1	Theatre	8	1	0	1
25	1	Grand mother	5	1	0	1	55	2	Circus	8	0	1	1
26	1	Wife	5	1	0	1	56	3	Pilot	9	8	4	12
27	2	Company	5	0	1	1	57	3	Eraser	9	5	1	6
28	2	Consultant	5	0	1	1	58	3	Car	9	4	2	6
29	2	Hearer	5	0	1	1	59	1	Chair	9	4	0	4
30	1	Doctor	6	5	0	5	60	1	Gun	9	4	0	4

= Facilitator/scaffolder, 10 = Knowledge provider, 11 = Molder/craftsperson, 12 = Nurturer/cultivator, 13 = Superior authoritative figure; ST: Student token or the number of times the metaphor is produced by students; TT: Teacher token or the number of times the metaphor is produced by teachers

Appendix B (Continued)

No	MV	Teacher Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum	No	MV	Teacher Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum
61	1	Window	9	4	0	4	99	1	Brief case	9	1	0	1
62	1	Bed	9	3	0	3	100	1	Cell phone	9	1	0	1
63	1	Bus	9	3	0	3	101	1	Classroom	9	1	0	1
64	1	Camera	9	3	0	3	102	1	Clock	9	1	0	1
65	3	Carpet	9	3	1	4	103	1	Colored pencil	9	1	0	1
66	1	Heater	9	3	0	3	104	1	Door	9	1	0	1
67	1	Prison	9	3	0	3	105	3	Dress maker	9	1	1	2
68	1	Road	9	3	0	3	106	3	Driver	9	1	2	3
69	1	Sofa	9	3	0	3	107	1	Elevator	9	1	0	1
70	1	Traffic light	9	3	0	3	108	1	Eye	9	1	0	1
71	1	Bridge	9	2	0	2	109	1	Gas	9	1	0	1
72	3	Comedian	9	2	1	3	110	1	Glove	9	1	0	1
73	1	Detective	9	2	0	2	111	1	Handkerchief	9	1	0	1
74	1	Feather	9	2	0	2	112	1	Hat	9	1	0	1
75	1	Glasses	9	2	0	2	113	3	Horse	9	1	1	2
76	1	Gold	9	2	0	2	114	1	Hospital	9	1	0	1
77	3	Machine	9	2	2	4	115	1	Metal	9	1	0	1
78	1	Marker	9	2	0	2	116	1	Money	9	1	0	1
79	1	Motorcycle	9	2	0	2	117	1	Moon	9	1	0	1
80	3	Pillow	9	2	1	3	118	1	Platform	9	1	0	1
81	1	Spoon	9	2	0	2	119	1	Rope	9	1	0	1
82	1	Umbrella	9	2	0	2	120	1	Rug	9	1	0	1
83	1	Vase	9	2	0	2	121	1	Saw	9	1	0	1
84	1	Wall	9	2	0	2	122	1	Screw driver	9	1	0	1
85	1	Washing machine	9	2	0	2	123	1	Seller	9	1	0	1
86	1	Whiteboard	9	2	0	2	124	1	Shoe	9	1	0	1
87	1	Worker	9	2	0	2	125	1	Slippers	9	1	0	1
88	1	Airport	9	1	0	1	126	1	Soft ware	9	1	0	1
89	1	Anorak	9	1	0	1	127	1	Stove	9	1	0	1
90	1	Appetizer	9	1	0	1	128	1	Sweet	9	1	0	1
91	1	Apron	9	1	0	1	129	1	Ticket	9	1	0	1

92	3	Battery	9	1	1	2	130	1	Tie	9	1	0	1
93	1	Belt	9	1	0	1	131	1	Tier	9	1	0	1
94	1	Blanket	9	1	0	1	132	1	Tire	9	1	0	1
95	1	Blouse	9	1	0	1	133	3	Tutor	9	1	1	2
96	1	Board	9	1	0	1	134	1	Vest	9	1	0	1
97	1	Boat	9	1	0	1	135	1	Waiter	9	1	0	1
98	1	Boulevard	9	1	0	1	136	2	Cloth	9	0	1	1

Appendix B (Continued)

No	MV	Teacher Metaphor	CV	ST	ТТ	Sum	No	MV	Teacher Metaphor	CV	ST	TT	Sum
137	2	Fuel	9	0	1	1	174	1	Spring	10	1	0	1
138	2	Phone	9	0	1	1	175	1	Stadium	10	1	0	1
139	2	Scissors	9	0	1	1	176	1	Teacher	10	1	0	1
140	2	Server	9	0	1	1	177	1	Tower	10	1	0	1
141	3	Candle	10	20	3	23	178	1	Village	10	1	0	1
142	3	Computer	10	7	2	9	179	1	Waterfall	10	1	0	1
143	1	Tree	10	7	0	7	180	1	Wave	10	1	0	1
144	1	Light	10	6	0	6	181	3	Writer	10	1	1	2
145	1	Mountain	10	6	0	6	182	2	Container	10	0	1	1
146	3	Sun	10	6	1	7	183	3	Researcher	11	6	3	9
147	1	TV	10	6	0	6	184	1	Barber	11	4	0	4
148	1	Flower	10	5	0	5	185	3	Conductor	11	2	3	5
149	1	Rain	10	4	0	4	186	3	Cook	11	2	2	4
150	1	House	10	3	0	3	187	1	Baker	11	1	0	1
151	1	Ink	10	3	0	3	188	1	Businessman	11	1	0	1
152	1	Water	10	3	0	3	189	1	Chemist	11	1	0	1
153	1	Bag	10	2	0	2	190	1	Engineer	11	1	0	1
154	3	Book	10	2	1	3	191	1	Groom	11	1	0	1
155	1	Jungle	10	2	0	2	192	1	Hammer	11	1	0	1
156	3	Library	10	2	1	3	193	3	Painter	11	1	2	3
157	1	Museum	10	2	0	2	194	1	Undertaker	11	1	0	1
158	1	Note book	10	2	0	2	195	2	Artist	11	0	2	2
159	1	Parrot	10	2	0	2	196	2	Cutter	11	0	2	2
160	1	Pen	10	2	0	2	197	2	Photographer	11	0	1	1
161	3	Radio	10	2	2	4	198	2	Programmer	11	0	1	1
162	1	Treasure	10	2	0	2	199	2	Sharpener	11	0	1	1
163	1	Wallet	10	2	0	2	200	3	Sea	12	8	4	12
164	3	Bookcase	10	1	1	2	201	3	Gardener	12	6	4	10
165	1	Dam	10	1	0	1	202	1	Cloud	12	5	0	5
166	1	Encyclopedia	10	1	0	1	203	3	Sky	12	3	1	4
167	1	Fire	10	1	0	1	204	1	Blood	12	2	0	2
168	1	Flood	10	1	0	1	205	1	Blossom	12	2	0	2
169	1	Magazine	10	1	0	1	206	1	Food	12	2	0	2
170	1	Mansion	10	1	0	1	207	1	Pizza	12	2	0	2
171	3	Owl	10	1	2	3	208	1	Apple	12	1	0	1
172	1	Picture	10	1	0	1	209	1	Bread	12	1	0	1
173	1	Pool	10	1	0	1	210	1	Cream	12	1	0	1

Appendix B (Continued)

No	MV	Teacher Metaphor	CV	ST	ТТ	Sum	No	MV	Teacher Metaphor	CV	ST	ТТ	Sum
211	1	Earth	12	1	0	1	229	2	Honey	12	0	1	1
212	3	Farm	12	1	1	2	230	2	Ice cream	12	0	1	1
213	1	Farmer	12	1	0	1	231	3	Boss	13	7	1	8
214	1	Field	12	1	0	1	232	1	Police	13	4	0	4
215	1	Garden	12	1	0	1	233	1	Professor	13	2	0	2
216	1	Kitchen	12	1	0	1	234	3	Ruler	13	2	1	3
217	1	Laptop	12	1	0	1	235	3	Babysitter	13	1	1	2
218	3	Ocean	12	1	2	3	236	1	Commander	13	1	0	1
219	1	Pepper	12	1	0	1	237	3	Creator	13	1	1	2
220	1	Queen	12	1	0	1	238	1	Interviewer	13	1	0	1
221	1	Restaurant	12	1	0	1	239	1	Lion	13	1	0	1
222	1	River	12	1	0	1	240	1	Police officer	13	1	0	1
223	1	Spice	12	1	0	1	241	1	President	13	1	0	1
224	1	Sponsor	12	1	0	1	242	1	Remote control	13	1	0	1
225	2	Baby	12	0	1	1	243	1	Rod	13	1	0	1
226	2	Cake	12	0	2	2	244	2	Big brother	13	0	1	1
227	2	Chocolate	12	0	1	1	245	2	Ox	13	0	1	1
228	2	Grape	12	0	1	1			Total		504	140	644

REFERENCES

- [1] Burke, K. (1945). A grammar of motives. New York: Prentice Hall.
- [2] Cameron, L. (1999). 1 Operationalizing 'metaphor' for applied linguistic research. In L. Cameron, & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 3-28). Cambridge: CUP.
- [3] Khodadady, E. (1997). Schemata theory and multiple choice item tests measuring reading comprehension. Unpublished PhD thesis, the University of Western Australia.
- [4] Khodadady, E. (1999). Multiple-choice items in testing: Practice and theory. Tehran: Rahnama.
- [5] Khodadady, E., & Elahi, M. (2012). The Effect of Schema-Vs-Translation-Based Instruction on Persian Medical Students' Learning of General English. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (1), xx-xxx.
- [6] Khodadady, E., & Herriman, M. (2000). Schemata theory and selected response item tests: from theory to practice. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *Fairness and validation on language assessment* (pp. 201-222). Cambridge: CUP.
- [7] Khodadady, E., Pishghadam, R., & Fakhar, M. (2010). The relationship among reading comprehension ability, grammar and vocabulary knowledge: An experimental and schema-based approach. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 6(2), 7-49.
- [8] Khodadady, E., Shirmohammadi, S., & Talebi, F. (2011). Brainstorming and its effect on critical thinking and speaking skills. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 7(1), 51-66.
- [9] Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2005). Metaforlar Hayat, Anlam ve Dil. (Cev: G. Y. Demir). Istanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
- [10] Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [11] Perrine, L. (1971). Four forms of metaphor. College English, 33, 125-138.
- [12] Phillips, D. C. (1996). Philosophical perspectives. In D. C. Berliner, & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 1019–1105). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- [13] Richards, I. A. (1936/1979). The philosophy of Rhetoric. Oxford: OUP.
- [14] Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. (2001). Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis (2nd ed.). Cambridge: CUP.
- [15] Saban, A., Kocbeker, B. N., & Saban, A. (2007). Prospective teachers' conceptions of teaching and learning revealed through metaphor analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 17, 123-139.
- [16] Yazici, N. (2010). Metaphors on "Literature" by teachers-to-be graduates of Turkish language and literature departments. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2, 5339-5343. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.870.
- [17] Yob, I. M. (2003). Thinking constructively with metaphors. Studies in Philosophy and Education, 22, 127-138.

Ebrahim Khodadady is an academic member of English Language and Literature Department at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. His main research interests are Testing, Language Learning and Teaching.

Mostafa Morady Moghaddam is currently a PhD student of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at University of Tabriz, Iran.

Hoda Kanan Azar is an MA student of Teaching English as a Foreign Language at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran, International Branch