Metaphors of early childhood education student teachers at the beginning of the university studies

Anneli Niikko

University of Eastern Finland, email: anneli.niikko@uef.fi,
https://orcid.org/ 0000-0001-5242-1008

ABSTRACT: This study examined ECE student teachers' metaphors about the teacher, children, and ECEC centre at the beginning of the study in 1992, 2008, 2013, and 2017. Similarities and differences were also explored. The theoretical overview of metaphors and metaphor studies formed the basis for the study. 122 voluntary students participated in the study. Data were collected using metaphors and open-ended questions and analysed using content analysis. Students emphasized the teacher as a mother and leader of a child group. Children were highlighted as seedlings and friends. ECEC centre was stressed as a children's playground and home. The study found that students placed very little emphasis on learning and cognitive challenges and ignored negative views. Differences were also found. The students of 1992 and 2008 emphasized the teacher as the leader of the child group and as the children's friend. Children were also highlighted as a herd of wild foals and monkeys. ECEC centre was emphasized as a summer camp. The students of 2013 and 2017 emphasized the teacher as a lighthouse and a mainstay of flowers. Children were highlighted as flowers, blank paper, play dough, bringers of joy, and as their own children. Metaphors offer educators a tool that helps students analyse their views and experiences about themselves, children, and ECEC centre. Educators can help students explore positive and negative metaphors, generate new metaphors, and thus develop professionally.

Keywords: *content analysis, early childhood education student teacher (ECE student teacher), early childhood teacher education, metaphor*

Introduction

Early childhood education is an important part of children's development, growth and learning path. Both Act on Early Childhood Education and Care (540/2018) and the guidelines for early childhood education curriculum (Finnish National Agency for Education [EDUFI], 2022), and curriculum studies (e.g., Onnismaa & Paalanen, 2019; Rosqvist et al., 2019) emphasize the view of the child as a valuable and unique individual who has the right to be considered and understood as an active member of her/his community. The implementation of early childhood education requires educators, who create a trusting relationship with children, meet their needs and promote their well-being. Educators bring to the different stages of the children's day the whole of care, education, and teaching, which they emphasize in different ways with children of different ages (EDUFI, 2022). An important part of implementing early childhood education is the learning environment, which includes physical, socio-emotional, and cognitive dimensions. The learning environment offers opportunities for a variety of versatile pedagogical activities and for passing on the experiences of previous generations, cultural heritage and knowledge produced by different subjects (EDUFI, 2022; Raittila, 2013). In ECEC centre, early childhood education takes place in the interaction of educators, children, and the learning environment, where education, teaching, and care on the one hand and growing, development and learning on the other form a whole. Also, educators, children, and the learning environment form a whole and are intertwined (EDUFI, 2022).

The purpose of this study is to use metaphors to find out qualitatively the views of Finnish early childhood student teachers about the teacher, children, and ECEC centre at the beginning of their studies. A review of the research literature reveals that student teachers' views on the teacher, children, ECEC centre, and school have been studied quite a lot (e.g., Barnard et al., 2022; Bergmark et al., 2018; Clandinin, 2013; Ng et al., 2009; Onnismaa et al., 2015; Rantamies et al., 2018; Von Wright, 1997). Interestingly, in previous studies, student teachers' perceptions of the teacher, children and ECEC centre have been examined mainly separately. This study investigates the views of student teachers about the teacher, the children, and the ECEC centre simultaneously. The assumption is that by doing this, the students' overall view of the teacher, the children and ECEC centre will be found out, and metaphors that may be related to each other will be detected.

The study uses metaphor, which has proven to be a good tool to produce things that are otherwise difficult to express or that are complex or that need to be expressed briefly and

concisely (Kövecses, 2002; Lakoff & Turner, 1989). The study is based on the idea that metaphors are important in the thinking of student teachers and reflect the meanings that they give to the teacher, the children, and ECEC centre (Auranen, 2004; Kövecses, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). A research literature on metaphor studies yielded only 16 studies that proved relevant to the study. Five metaphor studies investigated teachers' or student teachers' views of the teacher (Aldemir & Sezer, 2009; Eren & Tekinarslan, 2013; Karila & Nummenmaa, 2001; Mahlios & Maxson, 1998; Saban et al., 2006). Three metaphor studies investigated teachers' views of children or students (Ergin, et al., 2013; Mahlios & Maxson, 1998; Saban, 2010). There were four metaphor studies related to school (Cerit, 2006; Demir, 2007; Mahlios & Maxson, 1998; Saban, 2003) and four metaphor studies related to ECEC centre or a similar environment (Auranen, 2004; Fenech et al., 2020; Hagen et al., 2019; Karila & Nummenmaa, 2001). It is noteworthy that out of 16 studies, only one study (Mahlios & Maxson, 1998) investigated teachers' perceptions of teaching, childhood, and school.

The study is expected to reveal the students' understandings and reflect their experiences of the objects being studied. The students' metaphors are formed from their individual experiences and interpretations, which the researcher describes as such as the students have experienced them (Asworth & Lucas, 1998). Students' knowledge is thought to be relational and is created through thinking and experienced in interaction with the environment and culture in which they have lived before entering early childhood teacher education (Marton, 1998).

The study relies on a nondualist ontological perspective, according to which the subject and the object are intertwined and the different ways with which students experience and understand phenomena meet. The environment and cultural contexts have been part of the students' relationship and their experiences (Cohen et al., 2007; Mack, 2010). The theoretical foundation of the study is in comparative and conceptual metaphor theories. Comparison here means that some abstract or unknown thing is compared to a more familiar or more concrete thing (Fogelin, 2011; Kövecses, 2002; Ortony et al., 1978; Searle, 1993). Conceptualization signifies that concrete things are used to conceptualize abstract things (Jensen, 2006; Kövecses, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; Saban et al., 2006).

The study is useful for developing early childhood education and early childhood teacher education. Teacher educators can use metaphors to help students examine their views and experiences of themselves as teachers, the children they want to work with, and ECEC centre they want to be teachers in. Teacher educators can use metaphors to help students become familiar with educational and teaching practices and working with children. Metaphors can also provide an interesting tool to support students in their professional development.

Early childhood education and early childhood teacher education

The context of the study is the university's early childhood teacher education which includes theoretical studies as well as working in ECEC centre. Thus, theoretical study and practical early childhood education are intertwined. Both are financed with public funds and guided by different regulations. In this study, describing the context makes metaphors understandable and shows that metaphors are context-bound (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003).

The roots of Finnish day care are in the German pedagogy of Frobel (Hänninen & Valli, 1986). Social and economic development of society, Nordic welfare policy, needs of families and international pedagogical flows have changed day care quantitatively and qualitatively. The national reform of pre-school education implemented at the turn of the millennium divided the activities of pre-school education and day care into two governing bodies. Pre-school education was provided by the Ministry of Education and Culture and day care by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (Onnismaa & Paalanen, 2019). The first national core curriculum for early childhood education and care entered into force in 2005 (Stakes, 2005). The curriculum consists of care, upbringing, and teaching, which is planned and goal-oriented interaction and cooperation, and where the child's independent play is central. The goal is to promote each child's well-being, growth, development, and learning, and to strengthen behaviour patterns and ways of working that considers others, and to increase each child's independence. Playing, moving, exploring, and expressing in different areas of art are children's characteristic ways of acting, thinking, and learning (Stakes, 2005).

A significant change took place in 2013, when day care was administratively transferred from the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health to the Ministry of Education and Culture. The concept early childhood education was officially introduced (Onnismaa & Paalanen, 2019). The purpose of the change was to combine day care, preschool and basic education into one entity structurally, educationally, and pedagogically. Act on Day Care (36/1973) was updated to Act on Early Childhood Education and Care (580/2015). This marked the transition from day care to early childhood education. National ECEC curriculum was drawn up in 2016 (EDUFI, 2016).[1] The ECEC curriculum refers to a planned and goal-

---

[1] The following national curricula for early childhood education and care were supplemented in 2018 (EDUFI, 2018) and this year in 2022 (EDUFI, 2022).

oriented and holistic education, teaching, and care, in which special emphasis is placed on children's play and pedagogy. The goal is to promote growth and learning, health, and well-being according to the age and development of each child. Children learn by playing, moving, exploring, doing different work tasks, expressing themselves in art-based activities. Pedagogy is a planned and goal-oriented activity carried out by professional staff for the realization of children's well-being and learning. ECEC refers to pedagogical activities in ECEC centre and it is intended for children aged 1–5 years. Pre-school education as part of ECEC and primary school includes systematic teaching and instruction in the year before the start of compulsory education (at the age of 6) (Act amending the Basic Education Act, 1216/2020; Act on Early Childhood Education and Care, 580/2015).

Finnish early childhood teacher education (before kindergarten teacher education) began in 1892 in Swedish and in 1905 in Finnish. Early childhood education teachers (ECE teacher(s)) were educated until 1995 in kindergarten teacher seminars with an emphasis on theoretical study, Frobel pedagogy and practical education (Hänninen & Valli 1986). When the education of a kindergarten teacher was transferred to the university in 1995, the education became academic and based on research data. The curriculum includes general and special studies in education and in early childhood pedagogy, as well as practical education (Karila et al., 2017). Early childhood teacher education follows European degree standards, with a bachelor's degree requiring 180 credits. Many of the students complete a master's degree (120 credits) in early childhood education. After the bachelor's degree, a student is eligible for professional positions as ECE teacher (The University Act 558/2009; Government Decree 421/2012; Government Decree 1039/2013).[2]

Theoretical framework for metaphor study

The study uses a metaphor to explore students' perceptions of the teacher, children, and ECEC centre. Metaphor has a central task in the use of an individual's language, thinking, emotions, actions, and everyday life (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Our thinking is often abstract and complex, so it is easier to describe it using metaphors (Kövecses, 2002). Neufeld and Kompf (2002) mention that metaphor unifies conceptual realms such as the conscious with the subconscious and the internal vision with the external voice. Oxford et

---

[2] Under certain conditions, those students who have completed a university of applied sciences degree in the field of social and health are eligible for education, teaching, and care tasks (Act on Early Childhood Education and Care 540/2018).

al. (1998) remark that metaphors are a process of building linkages between knowledges in mind which make possible to perceive and understand a subject (abstract) from the perspective of another subject (concrete). Lakoff and Johnson (2003) highlight that our whole system of concepts and understanding is based on metaphor. Metaphor is not just a special feature of language use, but all of thinking is metaphorical in nature: physically, bodily and is culturally shaped. Metaphors are present in our everyday language, structure our thinking and affect our action. Metaphors are contextually and culturally bound, and are learned in communities (Cameron, 2003).

There are many theories of metaphor such as substitution (Black, 1992; Fisher & Grady, 1998; Kortelainen, 2009), comparison (Fogelin, 2011; Kortelainen 2005; Miller, 1993; Ortony et al.,1978; Saban et al., 2006) and interaction (Black, 1976; Richards, 1981) and theories of language use and cognition (Grady et al., 1996; Grant & Oswick, 1996; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; Jensen, 2006; Kortelainen, 2009; Kövecses, 2002; Saban et al., 2006). Often used metaphor theories in the science of education have been the theories of comparison and language use and cognition, which also serve as this framework for the study.

The comparison metaphor theory emphasises simile when some unknown thing is compared to a more familiar or more concrete thing. This theory creates a precondition for comparing an unknown or an abstract or a not-so-familiar thing (teacher) with the more familiar or concrete thing (mother) using 'simile' that includes the switching element 'like' or 'as if', for instance, "A teacher is like a mother". Kövecses (2002) emphasises that we create comparative links with other more concrete things when we want to understand an abstract matter in depth. However, simile as a metaphoric comparison does not behave as a literal comparison and does not create similarity, but rather refers to similarity between two things and adds 'like' or 'as if' between two things. Simile cannot be converted into a mirror image as can be done in similarity. Simile is not true either (Miller, 1993; Ortony et al.,1978; Saban et al., 2006). In the example above where the teacher is compared to the mother, the features of the teacher that are "like" the features of the mother are identified. An essential set of these common features is selected to form a metaphor.

Conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) offers a possibility to consider and understand an abstract concept and/or thing in relation to more concrete language-based concept and thing. The basic idea of a metaphor is to understand one thing through another (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). CMT is described with abstract target domain B (love) and concrete source domain A (nutrient). Source domain is used to conceptualize one or a small number of aspects of the target domain. The metaphor process proceeds from the concrete to the abstract, not the other way around (Kövecses, 2002; Jensen, 2006; Saban

et al., 2006). The condition for the success of a metaphor is that from source domain A, enough analogies can be found in relation to the target domain B. Identifying happens on the level of images or symbols. Equivalence between the source and target domains is structural.

There are flaws in both theories. For example, comparison theory does not give an answer to which criteria are used to select features to form a metaphor. Comparative metaphor theory also does not consider the context and situation in which the metaphor is produced. Respectively, CMT leaves open what means "enough analogies". The idea that the source domain is used to conceptualize one or a small number of aspects of the target domain is imprecise. Previous metaphor studies show that the theories in question can be used, even though they have been found to be flawed. Based on this, I have applied the theories above in my research.

Empirical framework for metaphor study

The empirical framework of the study is built from 16 studies that concern the teacher, the child, and ECEC centre. Along with the theoretical framework, the selected metaphor studies help the researcher in processing and analysing data, as well as in interpreting and reflecting on the results.

Metaphor studies about the teacher

Among the studies on teacher studies, Saban and his colleagues (2006) and Eren and Tekinarslan (2013) asked Turkish prospective teachers to describe the concept of teacher through metaphor. The study of Saban and his colleagues (2006) revealed that the students most emphasised the teacher both as the source of knowledge (flower, tree), and a transmitter of knowledge (candle, lighthouse), and as moulder or craftsperson (painter, baker, and potter). The student teachers highlighted the teacher as archetype of spirit (parent, friend, and companion) and as nurturer (gardener, farmer). The students also stressed the teacher as an instructor (compass, traffic sign) and as a collaboration leader (guide, coach). According to the researchers the metaphors described, on the one hand, the teacher as a supporter of the students' growth, looking after their well-being and providing a learning environment. On the other hand, the metaphors highlighted the teacher as a guide who guides students in the learning process and knowledge building. In Eren and Tekinarslan's (2013) study, the student teachers emphasised the teacher as mother (nurturing of student), tree, sun, and lighthouse (guidance of the student) and as a source of knowledge (book, treasure, internet). What both studies have in common was

that the students in both researchers emphasized very little the teacher as an authority figure (ship captain) and entertainer (actor).

Aldemir and Sezer (2009) metaphorically studied American early childhood education student teachers' image of teachers. Most of the students described the ECE teacher as a guide who helps children find their own way. Some students described the teacher as sunshine and water that helps children develop optimally. Two students used the metaphor "teacher as a friend", which the researchers said referred to a romantic view of the teacher and their previous school years. In Mahlios and Maxson's (1998) metaphor study, the central themes regarding the teaching of American primary and secondary preservice teachers were teaching as guiding and nurturing action. Further, the teacher was emphasized as the encourager of students' knowledge acquisition. Particularly, the primary school student teachers highlighted the teacher who nourishes and supports the students.

Karila and Nummenmaa (2001) metaphorically studied the Finnish ECEC centre staff's views of themselves in the work community. The results revealed that the ECEC centre staff described themselves as a "spare mother" who takes care of the children in a motherly way, creates security for them, listens to them, considers their wishes, and supports the children's growth and gives them a good start in life. The staff described the work community as a family.

As the whole, in these studies, teacher is emphasised as a mother or a spare mother, a guide, a leader, and as a transmitter of knowledge. The teacher was described with many metaphors. Eren and Tekinarslan (2013) remark that complex and abstract concepts such as teacher, teaching, or learning require multiple metaphors. Accordingly, Mahlios and Maxson (1998) found that many of the metaphors have consequences. For example, student teachers who described the teacher as a guide emphasized encouraging of children and learning of new things.

Metaphor studies about a child/student

There were only a few metaphor studies that examined teachers' or student teachers' views of children. For example, Ergin et al.'s (2013) study, which metaphorically explored Turkish preschool teachers' views of the child. In the study, the most popular categories were child as a moulding raw material (toy dough, mud) and child as a source of happiness, love, and joy (smile, beauty, and happiness, joy of life and source of fun). According to the researchers the first category refers to the traditional way of rearing and the second one refers to a source of love. The preschool teachers also emphasised the child as a developing organism (tree, plant) and a valuable organism (work of art,

diamond, light). A child as a developing organism is related to the idea that a child grows and develops with sufficient support, while a child as a valuable organism is related to the idea that children are valuable because they are the future. According to the researchers, children as a passive recipient (white sheet, empty container) is connected to a passive recipient of knowledge.

Saban's (2010) study of Turkish prospective teachers' metaphorical conceptualizations of learner revealed that the most common themes were students as raw material shaped by the teacher (play dough, clay, and stone) and as an empty container (white page, hard disk, trash can) into which the teacher transfers knowledge. Students were also seen as a developing organism (seedling, seed) that grows by receiving water, food, and sunlight. The two least mentioned themes were students as knowledge constructor (bee, detective) and students as social participants (footballer, musician).

Mahlios and Maxson (1998) explored childhood through metaphors among American elementary and secondary preservice teachers. The results showed that 80% of all childhood metaphors mentioned by elementary teachers were related to metaphors such as flower blooms and the bubbling spring. For secondary teachers, metaphors of childhood were flower, spring, and wind, which covered 60% of the responses. Still elementary student teachers more emphasised on nourishment, while secondary student teachers more highlighted discipline.

In summary, these studies consider the child/student more as a raw and moulding material (dough, clay) than as an active creator of knowledge. Mahlios and Maxson (1998) and Ergin et al. (2013) point out that many teachers and student teachers have a traditional view of the child. Saban (2010) draws attention to the need for alternative metaphors, because one metaphor is not enough to define the concept of "child".

Metaphor studies about day care centre/school

A few metaphor studies were found in ECEC centre /school. Mahlios and Maxson (1998) studied American elementary and secondary preservice teachers' experiences of school. Elementary student teachers emphasised a family whereas the student teachers in secondary teacher education highlighted a team. Saban (2003), on the other hand, studied Turkish prospective elementary school teachers' experiences of the past and ideal elementary school through metaphors. The results showed that the most chosen metaphors representing past elementary school experiences were school as a factory, hospital, and family, while the most preferred three metaphors for ideal elementary school were family, garden, and restaurant.

Karila and Nummenmaa (2001) metaphorically studied the Finnish ECEC centre staff's views of ECEC centre. Participants depicted ECEC centre as "second home" and "extended family". ECEC centre was also described as "flower market," where is movement, hustling and bustling. Some respondents associated emotional, close, and positive meanings to ECEC centre. Auranen (2004) also used metaphors to study Finnish day care and schoolwork communities as part of a municipal organization. The researcher found that participants described the work community as animals, family, genus, ship, crowd, and ant nest.

Fenech and her colleagues (2020) studied early childhood education centres in Australia. For example, in one early childhood education centres, educators used metaphors flexibly when discussing the qualitative benefits of early childhood education. They spoke of early childhood education centre as a happy home and a united family where every child is known, and every child feels special. Respectively, Hagen with her colleagues (2019) explored metaphorically the views of early childhood education staff on kindergarten playgrounds in Norway. The findings showed that playground was emphasised as a physical place with a wide range of activities for children. Most respondents mentioned that children like natural areas where they can use loose material to play.

In sum, these studies describe the ECEC centre/school as a family or an extended family or a united family where children/pupils are taken care of. ECEC centre /school is a pleasant environment where it is fun and where emotionality, closeness and positivity are central. Instead, negative factors are ignored. Cerit (2006) also found that teachers and students described the school with positive metaphors, while no negative metaphors were brought to light. Hagen and her colleagues (2019) point out that the kindergarten as a playground with a natural environment has a positive effect on children's physical and mental health, logical thinking, and quality of play.

Methods

Metaphor has been used to study educational phenomena and make teachers' perceptions, experiences, roles, and tasks visible (Botha, 2009; Eren & Tekinarsla, 2013; Hordvik et al., 2021). Here, metaphor is used as an approach and a tool to investigate the experiences of early childhood student teachers about the teacher, children, and ECEC centre at the beginning of the early childhood teacher education at a Finnish university in 1992, 2008, 2013 and 2017. The study years were chosen to obtain knowledge when the researcher worked at the university both as a researcher and as an educator in early

childhood teacher education. The research period was considered to provide an opportunity to examine similarities and differences between students.

The study questions are formulated based on comparative metaphor theory and conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), as well as metaphor studies about the teacher, child, and ECEC centre. The study questions are:

1) What kind of metaphors do students have of the teacher?

2) What kind of metaphors do students have of children?

3) What kind of metaphors do students have of ECEC centre?

4) What kind of similar and different metaphors are there between the students?

A total of 156 students participated in the study: 32 students (30 women, two men) in 1992, 38 students (37 women, one man) in 2008, 38 students (36 women, one man) in 2013, and 48 students (47 women, one man) in 2017. The number of men is very small in Finnish early childhood teacher education. Most of the participants were under 22 years of age, and the oldest was over 35 years old. The students' work experience with children varied from a few months to a few years. Some students did not have any work experience.

Data collection and analysis

When conducting research, the researcher must follow the ethical principles of the research, whether it is about the research permit, the persons participating in the research, the acquisition and processing of the material, and the publication of the results (Finnish National Board on Research Integrity [TENK], 2019; Kuula, 2011). In the study, the permission for data collection was obtained from the teacher education institution of the university.

Data were collected from students using a questionnaire (metaphor questions and open-ended questions) at the beginning of the study programme in 1992, 2008, 2013, and 2017. The researcher was assisted in the data collection by a teacher colleague. Students were told in their first lecture of early childhood education about a metaphor study (purpose, content, implementation, data processing). Voluntary participation of each student in the study was emphasized. The students were verbally asked for permission to use the answers for study purposes. In addition, the students were asked for permission to use authentic expressions in the study report, which (expressions) are marked: student 1, student 2, etc. The students were told that data is only for the use of the researcher, who will archive data after the study.

All participants received a questionnaire with the same instructions and 45 minutes to answer. The students were asked to complete the sentences: "as early childhood education teacher (a kindergarten teacher), I am like..."; "For me, children are like..." and " ECEC centre (kindergarten) is like...". Students were also asked to write about metaphors in more detail. A review of the data showed that some students had left a "blank paper". Some of the answers were incomplete. A total of 122 students participated in the study, divided into: 27 students in 2017, 30 students in 2008, 29 students in 2013, and 36 students in 2017. Students produced a total of 516 metaphors distributed: teacher 180, child 145, and ECEC centre 190 (see Appendixes 1, 2, 3).

The study used qualitative content analysis (Elo et al., 2014; Kyngäs et al., 2020; Rose, 2016) and the same researcher analysed data of all students. Word and sentence acted as a unit of analysis. The analysis was a process and included different steps. The researcher first read all the students' metaphors and their written descriptions several times to get an overall picture of the answers and to become familiar with the collected data (Kyngäs et al., 2020; Vaismoradi et al., 2013). The data analysis process took place by comparing metaphors to concrete things (e.g., a teacher is like a mother, a child is like a seedling, ECEC centre is like a home). Conceptual metaphor theory was utilized in such a way that analogies were sought between the concrete source domain (mother, seedling, home) and the abstract target domain (teacher, child, ECEC centre**)**. In this context, the analyses of the metaphor studies described in the article were examined. After this, the researcher compiled separate lists of metaphors for the teacher, children and ECEC centre and considered metaphors within each group and across the groups. The researcher also used the computer to help search for and underline similar and different metaphors about the teacher, the child, and ECEC centre. Appendices 1 (teacher), 2 (children), and 3 (ECEC centre) describe the categories and similar and different metaphors of students in different years. categories were organized according to how much they contained metaphor mentions.

Trustworthiness

According to researchers (Connelly, 2016; Korstjens & Moser, 2018; Kyngäs et al., 2020), trustworthiness is based on credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability which are considered as the quality criteria for qualitative study. Credibility and dependability were assessed with in relation to data collection and analysis. The credibility of the data was improved by considering that a) all students represented the early childhood teacher education; (b) all participants were at the beginning of their study programme; (c) all students received the same instructions, open-ended questions, and the same response time, and (d) the same person analysed all data at the same time. The researcher sought to maintain consistency in the analysis and interpretation through the

analysis process. The analysis of the data was guided by the theoretical and empirical basis of the study. The researcher was aware of the shortcomings related to the theories. The researcher also knew that interpreting metaphors is challenging and depends on the researcher's good knowledge of metaphor study. Confirmability means that the knowledge and interpretations of the results are derived from study data and are not based on the researcher's own views (Korstjens & Moser, 2018). The researcher reflected the analyses of data and discussed them with the study colleagues. The researcher was aware that metaphors are selective, restrictive, and emphasise certain features of the phenomenon, ignoring others (Demir, 2007; Ergin et al., 2013). Transferability refers to the extent to which qualitative research results can be transferred to other contexts (Korstjens & Moser, 2018). The researcher has explained with care the context of the study, the participants, and the study process, and illustrated the results with tables and authentic expressions of the students. Hence, the reader can assess to what extent the results are transferable to another similar environment.

Findings

The purpose of this study was to use metaphors to find out the views of ECEC centre student teachers about the teacher, children, and ECEC centre at the beginning of their study in 1992, 2008, 2013 and 2017. Data were collected using a questionnaire covering a metaphor and open-ended questions. Data analysis revealed similar metaphors between students of different years and between students of the same year but differences in metaphors were also observed.

Students' metaphors about a teacher

The student teachers' metaphors about the teacher covered the categories:

teacher as a caring mother, teacher as leader of the child group, teacher as a guide, and teacher as a transmitter of knowledge.

Teacher as a caring mother was the largest category. In this category, students similarly emphasised the teacher as a mother or a spare mother who is warm, safe, and takes care of children, and will set rules if necessary. One student commented "*As a teacher I am mother, who cares of children and supports them*" (Student 21/2008). Students except the 2017 students highlighted the teacher as a parent, a big sister, a grandmother, or an aunt who cares, helps, advises, and protects children. The studies of Eren and Tekinarslan (2013) and partly by Karila and Nummenmaa (2001) emphasised the teacher as a mother

or a spare mother who is caring, nurturing, loving, understanding, protective, and responsible and who strives to make children (students) feel safe.

The teacher as leader of the child group was the second largest category. Similarly, students emphasised the teacher as a group leader who oversees children's play and ensures that each child can act. One student expressed "*As a teacher, I am a group leader and I direct activities. I am also an authority ...*" (Student 15/2008). Individual students in 2008 and 2017 highlighted the teacher as a policeman or security guard who observes and monitors children's activities. Some students in 1992 and 2013 emphasised the teacher as a captain in the child group. These findings are consistent with the studies that highlighted the teacher as a leader, authority, and observer (Saban et al., 2006).

The third largest category was *the teacher as a guide*. Students had no common metaphors in this category. Some students in 1992, 2013, and 2017 underlined the teacher as a guide. One student mentioned "*I am as the teacher a guide who guides children in play activities where children have a key role*" (Student 47/2013). A couple of students in 2013 and 2017 emphasised the teacher as a person who is like a mainstay for flowers supporting their growth*.* The results are related to those metaphor studies where teachers and student teachers emphasized the teacher as a guide who guides children to build their own understanding (Aldemir & Sezer, 2009; Saban et al., 2006).

A few students in 1992 and 2008 emphasised the teacher as a friend who helps and supports children when needed. Similar results have also been obtained in other studies (Aldemir & Sezer, 2009; Saban et al., 2006) that focus on a teacher as a friend who listens to students' problems and assists them to be successful. In 2013 and 2017, there were students who stressed the teacher a guidepost or a compass. One student explained *I am as the teacher like a compass that helps children to move forward*" (Student 39/2017). Also, Saban and his colleagues (2006) found that some respondents emphasised the teacher as a compass and a traffic sign.

One of the smallest categories was *the teacher as a source of knowledge*, where students had no common metaphors, and the 1992 students had no metaphors. The students except students in 1992 emphasised the teacher as the sun. Some students in 2013 and 2017 highlighted the teacher as the illuminating lighthouse. These results are like the studies (Aldemir & Sezer, 2009; Eren & Tekinarslan, 2013; Saban et al., 2006) that highlighted the teacher both as a lighthouse that illuminates students' journeys and as sunlight that illuminates students with important knowledge.

The smallest category was *the teacher as transmitter of knowledge*, which students highlighted in the same way. For example, one student illustrated: "*For me as the teacher*

is important that children understand knowledge I transmit" (Student 16/2008). This finding consistent with the study of Saban and his colleagues (2006) that stressed the teacher as a provider or transmitter of knowledge and children as recipients of knowledge.

Students' metaphors about a child

The student teachers' metaphors about the child included the categories:

a child as a developing organism, a child as a friend, a child as a source of joy, a child as a passive recipient, a child as a mouldable material and a child as a creator of the new.

The child as a developing organism was the largest category including two subcategories: children as plants and children as animals. Children as plants covered metaphors: seed, seedling, sprout, flower, tree, and roots. In the same way, students emphasised children as seedlings that need a teacher's support, care, help, and nutrition to grow. Students except students in 1992 highlighted children as flowers. Children are like flower buds that a teacher can help grow and burst into bloom. The subcategory: children as animals contained metaphors such as ant, mouse, sheep, puppy, caterpillar, butterfly, bird, and squirrel. Students except students in 2008 had individual students who emphasised children as puppies in need of care. The 2008 and 2017 students stressed children as caterpillars with vulnerable in need of help to grow. Students in 1992 and 2008 differed from the other students by describing children with metaphors such as the monkey herd, the wild foal herd, and the fish flock. One student pointed "*Children are like an enthusiastic herd of monkeys, wild and vivid* (Student 15/1992). Students in 2013 and 2017 emphasised children more as flowers than students in 1992 and 2008. The results are consistent with studies (Ergin et al., 2013; Mahlios & Maxson, 1998; Saban, 2010) that emphasized children as growing seedlings, seeds and trees, flowers with sufficient support, water, nutrition, minerals, and sunlight. The results are also in line with the research of Saban and his colleagues (2006), that stressed children as birds and mouses in need of care, support, and food.

The second largest category was *the child as a friend*. In this category, students similarly emphasized children as friends with whom the teacher can experience new things and have fun. One student demonstrated "*Children are like friends. We have fun and we enjoy being together…*" (Student 12/2008). Children as friends also need the teacher's help and support. One student pointed "*Children are like friends whom I can support and advice*" (Student 06/2013). The students except for 2017 students, emphasized children as colleagues and small or creative artists who gradually draw their own picture of the world around them.

The third largest category was *the child as a source of joy*. Students except students in 2017 emphasized children as toddlers who are happy and playful creatures and need adult care. Individual students in 2013 and 2017 emphasised children as bringers of joy and as own children. One student said, "*Children are bringers of joy on my gloomy morning*" (Student 01/2017). Also, in Ergin et al.'s (2013) study, preschool student teachers emphasized children as a source of joy and happiness and positively influenced them as teachers.

In the category*: the child as a passive recipient and mouldable*, the students did not have common metaphors. A few students in 2013 and 2017 emphasised children as blank paper, a textbook, and play dough, which the teacher gradually shapes and fills with knowledge. Also in other studies, children have been described as white sheets and empty containers (Ergin et al., 2013) or as white pages and empty brains (Saban, 2010). On the other hand, children have been depicted as dough, stone, and clay in the hands of the potter (Saban, 2010). The smallest category was *the child as the creator of the new*, highlighted by individual students in 1992, 2008, and 2013.

Students' metaphors from ECEC centre

Student teachers' metaphors about ECEC centre covered the categories:

ECEC centre as children's place, ECEC centre as home, ECEC centre as workplace, ECEC centre as camping site, ECEC centre as school and ECEC centre as colourful place.

ECEC centre as children's place was the largest category. Students emphasised ECEC centre as a playground, which is s safe and comfortable place for children to grow up and learn with peers. One student said, "ECEC centre *is like a playground where children can learn new things*" (Student 04/2008). The playground also inspires children to action and play, and children have fun and freedom to express themselves. Some students in 2013 and 2017 emphasised ECEC centre as learning place and an amusement park where children can act in their own way, but the rules must be followed. Hagen and her colleagues (2019) found that Norwegian ECE teachers emphasised the playground as attractive place that is not pre-built and where children can act spontaneously.

ECEC centre as home was the second largest category. Students highlighted ECEC centre as a home and another home that is a comfortable and safe place for children to enjoy, develop and learn with peers. One student commented, " ECEC centre *is like a home where children can be free… with friends and safe adults*" (Student 28/2008). Students except students in 2017 emphasised ECEC centre as a home with a warm atmosphere. Some students in 2013 stressed ECEC centre as grandparent's home, big family, and warm lap.

Metaphor studies by Cerit (2006), Demir (2007), Mahlios and Maxon (1998) emphasized the school as a family where students ar ECEC centre e supported and cared for and where the environment is pleasant. In Karila and Nummenmaa's study (2001), ECEC centre was emphasized as a "second home" and as an "extended family". In Fenech et al.'s (2020) study, one of the quality factors of an ECE centre for teachers was a "happy home" where children feel special, get along with others, and have fun.

The third largest the category was *ECEC centre as a workplace*. In this category, student teachers did not have common metaphors. Except the students in 2008, there were some students who emphasized ECEC centre as a safe and comfortable workplace where the teacher and children can work together. One student stated, " ECEC centre *as a workplace is for children and for me both a small and a big world to work with*" (Student 19/2017). ECEC centre as a workplace was also a place for children to learn and experience things.

The fourth largest category was *ECEC centre as a camping site*. Some students, except for the students of 2013, emphasized ECEC centre as a camp or summer camp. A student from 2008 said that the ECEC centre as a summer camp offers children versatile activities.

One of the smallest categories was *ECEC centre as a school* where students in 2017 had no metaphors. Individual students highlighted ECEC centre as a school that is a paradise of diverse knowledge and there are lot of material for children to use. In the study of Cerit (2006), the school was also highlighted as a place of knowledge. The smallest category was ECEC centre as a colorful place. In this category, students did not have common metaphors, but individual students in the groups had metaphors.

Discussion

This study investigated the views of early childhood student teachers about the teacher, children, and ECEC centre in 1992, 2008, 2013 and 2017 through metaphors. In the field of early childhood education research, the study can be considered valuable because the data has been collected over a long period. In addition, the same researcher has collected data using the same data collection tool (metaphor questions and open-ended questions) and analysed data. The study can also be considered to have a novelty value, because unlike previous research, the study examined the students' perceptions of the teacher, the child, and ECEC centre at the same time. What makes the study interesting, on the other hand, is that the results showed how the students' perceptions of the teacher, children and ECEC centre intertwine, interact, and form a whole. On the other hand, what makes the study interesting is that differences were mainly found between the students of 1992 and 2008 and the students of 2013 and 2017. The study confirms previous studies (Eren

& Tekinarslan, 2013; Ergin et al., 2013; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; Oxford et al., 1998; Saban, 2010) in that student teachers have many metaphors about the teacher, children, and ECEC centre, before they come to study at university. In other words, one metaphor is not enough to understand the meanings of abstract concepts such as teacher, children, and ECEC centre.

In the profession of educator and teacher, especially when working with young children, the most important thing is a caring, loving, and compassionate teacher who takes care of children's development, growth, and learning (Aldemir & Sezer, 2009). In the study, the students of the different years similarly emphasized the teacher as *a mother* who is warm and safe, caring, nourishing, supportive, protective, and sets the necessary rules. This finding runs as a red thread through the curricula of day care and ECE curricula, where the teacher's task is to ensure the holistic well-being of the child (Sosiaalihallitus, 1975; Salminen, 1988; Stakes, 2005; EDUFI, 2016, 2018, 2022). The finding refers to the affective, emotional, and social qualities of the teacher and is connected to the traditional ideal image of a (good) mother (loving, patient, advising, child-respecting, and setting boundaries) (see Perälä-Littunen, 2004). Perälä-Littunen states that the image of a (good) mother seems to be very similar within a culture, regardless of when and under what conditions it is asked to define it.

When Katvala (2001) studied mother beliefs across generations, she found that there were certain beliefs about what a mother should be like. Katvala points that the beliefs about the mother are born at a particular historical and cultural time and place and indicate the strength and certain immutability. Referring to the observations of Katvala, it can be thought that student teachers' perceptions of the teacher as a mother may reflect common and prevalent views of the mother in Finnish society, which (views) have been widely accepted over time in different contexts and institutions. Katvala emphasizes that cross-cultural analyses show differences in perceptions of a "good mother". Motherhood is not a universal phenomenon, but a product of every culture. In other words, not all mothers think about motherhood the same way. An interesting challenge would be to find out in more detail, both nationally and internationally, early childhood education teachers' views on mother and motherhood, regarding the profession of early childhood education teacher.

The students of the different years emphasized the teacher as *the leader of the children's group* who supervises the children's play and working and ensures that each child's opportunity to act and get time from the teacher. Both the ethical principles of the teaching profession (OAJ, 2014) and the newest curriculum (EDUFI, 2022) emphasize the teacher's responsibility and duty to observe the activities of individual children and groups of children. Tirri and Kuusisto (2019) remark that the teacher has a pedagogical

responsibility on behalf of the profession to observe children's activities, make decisions, set rules, and give instructions.

The students' views of children revealed that they most described children as developing organisms, emphasizing children more as plants than as animals. A common shared metaphor for the students of the different years was children *as seedlings* that need the teacher's support, care, help, protection, and nourishment to grow. These features are similar that the students emphasized when talking about the teacher as a mother. Further, the students of the different years similarly emphasized the children *as friends* with whom the teacher enjoys, has fun, and experiences new things. The findings show the teacher's close and positive relationship with the children, the open and warm atmosphere, and the teacher's present. Children are emotionally important to the teacher's well-being. The findings reflect students' views of children as small, vulnerable, and helpless beings, who need a teacher to grow and develop (see Ergin et al., 2013; Mahlios & Maxson, 1998). On the other hand, the students' views do not emphasize the child as a competent learner and an active participant, which views are central in current views of education and learning.

Researchers and teachers agree that children need a physically, emotionally, and socially safe and versatile environment to grow and develop, play, act, and learn. The students of the different years similarly stressed ECEC centre as *a playground* that is a safe, comfortable, and fun place for children to be with their peers and safe adults, to learn new knowledge and skills through play and action, and to express own opinions. The students similarly highlighted ECEC centre as a *home* that includes the characteristics of a playground (safe, comfortable), the characteristics of the home environment (warm atmosphere and friends) and a teacher like mother (safe, caring and encouraging). These findings reflect earlier day care curricula (Sosiaalihallitus, 1975; Stakes, 2005) and studies (Brotherus et al., 2002) that show that ECEC centre has traditionally been characterized by physical safety, cosiness, a positive atmosphere, social relationships, and aesthetics. Some scholars (Cerit, 2006; Demir, 2007; Fenech et al., 2020) point out that ECEC centre as a home like place plays an important role to facilitate children's transition from home to ECEC centre. Karila and Nummenmaa (2001) are critical of the view of ECEC centre as a home, stating that teachers give up their professionalism when they emphasize ECEC centre as a home or a second home and the work community as a family.

As the whole, the results showed that by simultaneously studying the students' views of the teacher, children and ECEC centre, students of different years had similar metaphors about the teacher (mother, children's group leader, transmitter of knowledge), children (seedling, friend) and ECEC centre (children's playground, home). Similar metaphors of students from different years are related to each other, intertwine, and form a whole. The results support the early childhood education curriculum's emphasis that the teacher,

children, and ECEC centre form a whole and are connected (EDUFI, 2022). The results confirm the assumption presented in the introduction, that by studying the students' views of the teacher, children, and ECEC centre together with the help of a metaphor, it is possible to find out the students' overall views of the studied phenomena. By studying the whole, we get such knowledge that doesn't come out when we study the students' views about the teacher, the children, and ECEC centre separately.

Differences in metaphors were found between the students of 1992 and 2008 and the students of 2013 and 2017 in such a way that the students of 1992 and 2008 emphasized the teacher as *leader of the child group* more than the students of 2013 and 2017. They also highlighted the teacher as *a friend* of the children, which the students of 2013 and 2017 did not. In addition, the students of 1992 and 2008 stressed children as *a herd of monkeys and wild foal herd*. The findings refer to the previous curricula (Sosiaalihallitus, 1975; Salminen, 1988; Stakes, 2005) that emphasise the teacher's central role and task, the whole child group's activity and play. Respectively, the students in 2013 and 2017 highlighted the teacher as *a lighthouse* and as *a mainstay of flowers*. They stressed children as *blank paper, play dough*, as *bringers of joy,* and as their *own children*. Moreover, the students of 2013 and 2017 emphasized children as flowers more than the students of 1992 and 2008. These findings reflect the previous curricula (Sosiaalihallitus, 1975; Salminen, 1988; Stakes, 2005) in which the teacher's task is to be a source of knowledge to children and to shape their thinking through education and teaching. Overall, the differences in metaphors between the students of 1992 and 2008 and the students of 2013 and 2017 were not very large. It was more about differences in emphasis regarding the teacher's role and views on children. The differences brought up very little, if any, of the broader changes that occurred in public day care and early childhood education and care (ECEC) (concepts, administration, curricula, pedagogy), and early childhood teacher education (degree requirements, curriculum, qualifications) over the years of the study.

Summarising, students had positive views of early childhood education and care, working with children, acting as a teacher, and ECEC centre as an activity environment. These views are a good starting point for students' studying. Critically, the students' views on the teacher's role, children's abilities and the importance of the environment are narrow and mainly emphasized the socio-emotional perspective. The students paid very little attention to the cognitive challenges and ethical significance of education and teaching work, and to children as active participants. Interestingly, students did not present negative metaphors either.

The findings set challenges for early childhood teacher education. First, it is important for educators to be aware that student teachers' previous experiences and memories of teaching and learning, teachers' characteristics and being a student at school guide their

study (Aldemir & Sezer, 2009; Eren & Tekinarslan 2013). Second, teacher educators should familiarize themselves with the metaphors used by students to get a broader and holistic picture of students' views at the beginning of the education. Third, educators should help students explore both positive and negative metaphors and produce new metaphors. If students do not have the opportunity to become aware of their previous metaphors, it is likely that they will resort to these previous metaphors when acting later as teachers. Examining the metaphors used by students at different stages of early childhood teacher education can give educators valuable knowledge about how education and teaching influence and guide student teachers' thinking and professional development. However, this task requires that educators can have the opportunity to acquire research-based education (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021, 2022).

Although the results of the study show that metaphor questions and open-ended questions offer an interesting way to explore and illuminate student teachers' views, there are reasons to look at limitations of the study and topics for further research. One of the limitations of the study is related to the data analysis. The researcher had to conclude which parts had to be transferred, so-called from a concrete source area (mother) to an abstract target area (teacher). The same question seems to appear in other qualitative metaphor studies. The study also showed that, in addition to metaphor questions and open-ended questions, it would be good to supplement the acquisition of data with interviews. The study did not examine the relationships between conceptual categories, but it would be important to take it into account as well. The shortcoming of the study was that the students represented different years of education, so changes between students could not be examined. The next step could be to study the same students' metaphors throughout the study programme. Also, using metaphors, it would be interesting to find out the reasons for the lack of negative views of student teachers.

Acknowledgements

References

Act amending the Basic Education Act (1216/2020). [Laki perusopetuslain muuttamisesta 1216/2020]. https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2020/20201216

Act on Day Care (36/1973). [Päivähoitolaki 36/1973]. https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1973/19730036

Act on Early Childhood Education and Care (580/2015). [Varhaiskasvatuslaki 580/2015]. https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2015/20150580

Act on Early Childhood Education and Care (540/2018). [Varhaiskasvatuslaki 580/2018]. https://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2018/en20180540

Aldemir, J., & Sezer, O. (2009). Early childhood education pre-service teachers' images of teacher and beliefs about teaching. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, *10*(3), 105-122.

Asworth, P., & Lucas, U. (1998). What is the 'world' of phenomenography. *Scandinavian Journal of Education Research*, *42*(4), 415–431. https://doi.org/10.1080/0031383980420407

Auranen, J. (2004). A metaphor study on educational work as part municipal organization [Tervanjuontia ja ruusuilla tanssia - metaforatutkimus kasvatustyöstä kuntaorganisaation osana] (Publications in Education No. 97). University of Joensuu. https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:952-458-462-X

Bergmark, U., Lundstöm, S., Manderstedt, L., & Palo, A-B. (2018). Why become a teacher? Student teachers' perceptions of teaching profession and motives for career choice. *European Journal of Reacher Education, 41*(3), 266–281. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2018.1448784

Barnard, J., Metteney, M., & Lambirth, A. (2022). Beginner teachers and classroom communities: a thematic analysis of UK beginner teachers, experiences in initial teacher education and beyond. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 119*, 1-11. doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103871

Black, M. (1976). Metaphor. In M. Black (Ed.), *Models and metaphors. Studies in language and philosophy* (6th ed.) (pp. 25–47). Cornell University Press.

Black, M. (1992). *Models and metaphors*. Cornell University Press.

Botha, E. (2009). Why metaphor matters in education? *South African Journal of Education*, *29*(4), 431-444. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v29n4a287

Brotherus, A., Hytönen, J., & Krokfors, L. (2002). *Didactics of preschool and elementary education* [Esi- ja alkuopetuksen didaktiikka]. WSOY.

Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse. Advances in Applied Linguistics*. Continuum.

Cerit, Y. (2006). School metaphors: The views of students, teachers, and administrators. *Educational Science: Theory & Practice, 6*(3), 692–699.

Clandinin, J. 2013. Chapter 4 personal practical knowledge: A study of teachers' classroom images. In. *From teacher thinking to teachers and teaching: The evolution of research community.* In C.J. Craig, P.C. Meijer, and J. Broeckmans (Eds.), *Advances in Research on Teachin*g (Vol 19, pp. 67-96). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Connelly, L. (2016). Trustworthiness in qualitative research. *MEDSURG Nursing, 25*(6), 435–436*.

Demir, C E. (2007). Metaphors as a reflection of middle school students' perceptions of school: A cross-cultural analysis. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice,* 13(2), 89–107.

EDUFI (2016). National core curriculum for early childhood education and care. [Varhaiskasvatussuunnitelman perusteet 2016] (Regulations and guidelines: 2016:17). https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/varhaiskasvatussuunnitelman_perus teet_2016.pdf

EDUFI (2018). National core curriculum for early childhood education and care. [Varhaiskasvatussuunnitelman perusteet 2018] (Regulations and guidelines: 2018:3a). https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/varhaiskasvatussuunnitelman_perus teet.pdf

EDUFI (2022). National core curriculum for early childhood education and care. [Varhaiskasvatussuunnitelman perusteet 2022] (Regulations and guidelines: 2022:2a). https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/Varhaiskasvatussuunnitelman_peru steet_2022_1.pdf

Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste, O., Pölkki, T., Utriainen, K., & Kyngäs, H. (2014). *Qualitative content analysis: A focus on trustworthiness*. SAGE Open January-March 2014, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014522633

Eren, A., & Tekinarslan, E. (2013). Prospective teachers' metaphors: Teacher, teaching, learning, instructional material and evaluation courses. *International Journal Social Sciences and Education, 3*(2), 435–445.

Ergin, B., Shahin, M., & Erisen, Y. (2013). Prospective pre-school teachers' perceptions of "child": A study of metaphors. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, 4*(4), 88–101.

Fenech, M., Harrison, L. J., Press, F., & Sumsion, J. (2020). Using metaphor to illuminate quality in early childhood education. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, *45*(2), 197-210. https://doi.org/10.1177/1836939120918482

Finnish National Board on Research Integrity [TENK] (2019). *The ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland.* Publications of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK 3/2019. https://www.tenk.fi/en

Fisher, D., & Grady, N. (1998). Teachers' images of their schools and perceptions of their work Environments. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *9*(3), 334–348. https://doi.org/10.1080/0924345980090304

Fogelin, R. J. (2011). *Figurative speaking*. Oxford University Press.

Government Decree (421/2012) on university degrees on amending the annex to the government decree. [Valtioneuvoston asetus 421/2012 yliopistojen tutkinnoista annetun valtioneuvoston asetuksen liitteen muuttamisesta]. https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2012/20120421

Government Decree (1039/2013) on university degrees on amending the government decree. [Valtioneuvoston asetus 421/2012 yliopistojen tutkinnoista annetun valtioneuvoston asetuksen liitteen muuttamisesta]. https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2013/20131039

Grady, N.B., Fisher, D.L., & Fraser, B.J. (1996). Images of school through metaphor development and validation of questionnaire, *Journal of Educational Administration, 34*(2), 41–53.

Grant, D., & Oswick, C. (1996). Introduction: Getting the measure of metaphors. In D. Grant & C. Oswick (Eds.), *Metaphor and organization* (pp. 1–20). Sage.

Hagen, A., Skaug, H.N., & Synnes, K. (2019). Children's favourite places on the kindergarten playground - according to the staff. *Journal of the European Teacher Education Network*, *14*, 16–28. https://oda.oslomet.no/oda-xmlui/bitstream/handle/10642/8254/Children%E2%80%99s+favorite+places+on+the+kindergarten.pdf?sequence=1

Hordvik, M., Fletcher, T., Lund Haugen, A., Engebretsen, B., & Møller, L. (2021). Using the metaphor of orchestration to make sense of facilitating teacher educator professional development. European Journal of Teacher Education, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2021.1946510

Hänninen, S-L., & Valli, S. (1986). *History of Finnish kindergarten work and early childhood education* [Suomen lastentarhatyön ja varhaiskasvatuksen historia]. Otava.

Jensen, D. (2006). Metaphors as a bridge to understanding educational and social contexts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *5*(1), 36–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500104

Karila, K., Kosonen, T. & Järvenkallas, S. (2017). *Roadmap on the development of early childhood education for 2017–2030. Guidelines for increasing the degree of participation in early childhood education, and for the development of the skills of daycare centre staff, personnel structure, and training* [Varhaiskasvatuksen kehittämisen tiekartta vuosille 2017–2030. Suuntaviivat varhaiskasvatukseen osallistumisasteennostamiseen sekä päiväkotien henkilöstön osaamisen, henkilöstörakenteen ja koulutuksen kehittämiseen] (Publications of the Ministry of Education and Culture, Finland 2017:30). Ministry of Education and Culture. https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/80221/okm30.pdf

Karila, K., & Nummenmaa, A. R. (2001). *On the way to multi-professionalism. The daycare as the shooting destination* [Matkalla moniammatillisuuteen. Kuvauskohteena päiväkoti]. WS Bookwell.

Katvala, S. (2001). *Where's mother? Mothers and maternal beliefs over three generations* [Missä äiti on? Äitejä ja äitiyden uskomuksia sukupolvien saatossa] [Dissertation, University of Jyväskylä]. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research research, 186.

https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/41045/7/Katvala_Satu_screen.pdf

Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *European Journal of General Practice*, *24*(1), 120–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092

Kortelainen, I. (2005). *Paul Ricceur's metaphor theory* [Paul Ricceurin metaforateoria]. Tampereen yliopisto.

Kortelainen, I. (2009). Three interpretation models of metaphor [Metaforan kolme tulkintamallia]. *Niin & Näin*, 2, 65–69.

Kuula, A. (2011). *Research ethics, data acquisition, use and storage* [Tutkimusetiikka, Aineistojen hankinta, käyttö ja säilytys]. Vastapaino.

Kyngäs, H. (2020). Qualitative research and content analysis. In H. Kyngäs, K. Mikkonen, M. Kääriäinen (Eds.) *The application of content analysis in nursing science research* (pp. 3-12). Springer.

Kyngäs, H. Kääriäinen, M, & Elo, S. (2020). The trustworthiness of the content analysis. In H. Kyngäs, K. Mikkonen, M. Kääriäinen (Eds.) *The application of content analysis in nursing science research* (pp. 41-48). Springer.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. The University of Chicago Press. https://nyshalong.com/public/archive/20150131/20150131_ref.pdf

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. University of Chicago Press.

Mack, L. 2010. The philosophical underpinning of educational research. *Polyglossia*, 19, October.

Mahlios, M., & Maxson, M., (1998). Metaphors as structures for elementary and secondary preservice teachers' thinking. *International Journal of Educational Research, 29*(3), 227–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(98)00027-5

Marton, F. (1998). Phenomenography - A Research approach to investigating different understandings of reality. *Journal of Thought, 21*(3), 28–49.

Miller, G. (1993). Images and models, similes and metaphors. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 357-400). Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.2466/pr0.106.3.769-784.

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2021). *Programme for developing education and training provision and programmes in early childhood education and care 2021–2030* [Varhaiskasvatuksen koulutusten kehittämisohjelma 2021-2030] (Publications of the Ministry of Education and Culture 2021:3). Ministry of Education and Culture. https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/162662/OKM_2021_3.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2022). *Teacher Education Development Programme 2022–2026*. https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/164179/TeacherEducationDevelopmentProgramme.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Ng, W., Nicholas, H., & Williams, A. 2009. School experience influences on pre-service teachers' evolving beliefs about effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(2), 278–289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.010

Neufeld, J., & Kompf, M. (2002). Educational research and teacher development: from ivory tower to tower Babel. In C. Sugrue & C. Day (Eds.), *Developing teachers and teaching practice. International Research Perspective* (pp. 41-57). Routledge Falmer Press.

OAJ. (2014). *Teacher's professional ethics and ethical principles* [Opettajan ammattietiikka ja eettiset periaatteet]. Opetusalan Ammattijärjestö OAJ. https://www.oaj.fi/globalassets/julkaisut/2014/opettajanammattietiikkajaeettisetperiaatteet.pdf

Onnismaa, E-L., & Paananen, M. (2019). The formation of the early childhood education curriculum tradition in Finland from the 1970 s to the 2010s [Varhaiskasvatuksen opetussuunnitelmatradition muotoutuminen Suomessa 1970-luvulta 2010-luvulle]. In T. Autio, L. Hakala & T. Kujala (Eds.), *Transitions and signs of the times in education: perspectives from curriculum research [*Siirtymiä ja ajan merkkejä koulutuksessa: Opetussuunnitelmatutkimuksen näkökulmia] (pp. 189–220). Tampere University Press.

Onnismaa, E-L., Tahkokallio, L., & Kalliala, M. (2015). From university to working life: an analysis of field-based studies in early childhood teacher education and recently graduate kindergarten teachers' transition to work. *Early Years. An International Research Journal, 35*(2), 197–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2015.1011065

Ortony, A., Reynolds, R.E., & Arter, J. A. (1978). Metaphor: Theoretical and empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin, 85*(5), 919–943. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.85.5.919

Oxford, R., 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. https;//doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00071-7

Perälä-Littunen, S. (2004). *Cultural image of good mother and good father in three generations*. [Kulttuurinen mielikuva hyvästä äidistä ja hyvästä isästä kolmen sukupolven aikana] [Dissertation, University of Jyväskylä]. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research, 239. https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/13379/9513917797.pdf

Raittila, R. (2013). The small group activities and playgrounds. The pedagogical acting environment of early childhood education is constructed in everyday practices [Pienryhmätoiminta ja leikkialueet. Varhaiskasvatuksen pedagoginen toimintaympäristö rakentuu arkisissa käytännöissä] In K. Karila & L. Lipponen (Eds.) *Pedagogy of early childhood education* [*Varhaiskasvatuksen pedagogiikka]* (pp.69–94). Vastapaino.

Rantamies, E., Koivula, M., & Vähäsantanen, K. (2018). Kindergarten teacher as a supporter of children's autonomy in early childhood education [Lastentarhanopettaja lasten autonomian tukijana varhaiskasvatuksessa]. *Journal of Early Childhood Education Research, 7*(1), 53–75.

Richards, I. A. (1981). *The philosophy of rhetoric*. Oxford University Press.

Rose, G. (2016). *Visual methodologies: Introduction to researching with visual materials*. Sage.

Rosqvist, L., Kokko, M., Kinos, J., Robertson, L., Pukk, M., & Barbour, N. (2019). Child-oriented pedagogy constructed with early childhood educators [Lapsilähtöinen pedagogiikka varhaiskasvattajien kanssa konstruoituna]. *Journal of Early Childhood Education Research, 8*(1), 192–214.

Saban, A. (2003). A Turkish profile of prospective elementary school teachers and their views of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(8), 829–846. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.03.004

Saban, A. (2010). Prospective teachers' metaphorical conceptualizations of learner. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(2), 290–305. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.017

Saban, A., Koçbeker, B. N., & Saban, A. (2006). An investigation of the concept of teacher among prospective teachers through metaphor analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 6*(2), 509–522.

Salminen, H. (1988). *Daycare action plan for three- to five-year-old children* [Kolme-viisivuotiaiden lasten päivähoidon toimintasuunnitelma] (Sosiaalihallituksen julkaisuja1988:2). Valtion painatuskeskus.

Searle, J. R. (1993). Metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 83-111). The Press of the Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Sosiaalihallitus. (1975). *Joyful moments of action.* [Iloiset toimintatuokiot]. Valtion painatuskeskus.

STAKES (2005). National core curriculum for early childhood education and care [Varhaiskasvatuksen suunnitelman perusteet]. Social and health research and development center: Guides 56. https://www.julkari.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/77129/Varhaiskasvatussuunnitelman perusteet.pdf

The University Act (558/2009) [Yliopistolaki 558/2009]. https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2009/20090558.

Tirri, K., & Kuusisto, E. (2019). *Opettajan ammattietiikkaa oppimassa.* Caudeamus.

Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing and Health Sciences, 15*, 398–405.

Von Wright, M. (1997). Student teachers' beliefs and changing teacher role. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *20*(3), 257–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/0261976970200305

APPENDIX 1   Metaphors of student teachers of the teacher in 1992, 2008, 2013, and 2017

STUDENTS 1992		STUDENTS 2008		STUDENTS 2013		STUDENTS 2017	
Teacher as caring mother		**Teacher as caring mother**		**Teacher as caring mother**		**Teacher as caring mother**	
Parent	3	Nurse	1	Parent	1	Nurse	1
Mother	6	Mother	15	Mother	3	Mother	10
Grandmother	1	Big sister	3	Grandmother	1	Port of refuse	1
Gardener	3	Story ant	3	Caregiver	1	Warm lap/hug	2
	13	Warm lap	1	Fairy	1	Warm blanket	1
		Farmer	1	Gardener	1		*15*
			24		*8*		
						Total	**60**
Teacher as leader of the child group		**Teacher as leader of the child group**		**Teacher as leader of the child group**		**Teacher as leader of the child group**	
Leader	11	Leader	11	Leader	5	Leader	3
Camp instructor	5	Policeman	1	Shepard	1	Play supervisor	1
Ship captain	1		*12*	Captain	3	Security guard	1
Conductor of orchestra	2			Train locomotive	1		*5*
Trumpet player	1				*10*		
Violinist	1						
	21					**Total**	**48**
Teacher as a guide		**Teacher as a guide**		**Teacher as a guide**		**Teacher as a guide**	
Mainstay	1	Supporter	3	Mainstay	2	Mainstay	2
Friend	5	Friend	6	Personal trainer	1	Guide	5
Play mate	1	Play mate	1	Guide	2	Rower	2
Helping comrade	3		*10*	Guidepost	1	Map	1
Guide	5				*6*	Compass	1
Road sign	2						*11*
Inspirer	4						
	21					**Total**	**48**
Teacher as source of knowledge		**Teacher as source of knowledge**		**Teacher as source of knowledge**		**Teacher as source of knowledge**	
	-	Sun	1	Sun	4	Sun	1
		Colour sweater	1	Lighthouse	2	Light in the dark	1
		Joy pill	1		*6*	Lighthouse	1
			3			Energy flow	1
						Calm sea	1
							5
						Total	**14**
Teacher as transmitter of knowledge		**Teacher as transmitter of knowledge**		**Teacher as transmitter of knowledge**		**Teacher as transmitter of knowledge**	
Transmitter of knowledge	3	Transmitter of knowledge	1	Transmitter of knowledge	1	Transmitter of knowledge	2
Message broker	1		*1*	Wind	1		*2*
Postman	1				*2*		
	5					**Total**	**10**
	60		*50*		*32*		*38*
						Teacher metaphors 180	

APPENDIX 2   Metaphors of student teachers of children in 1992, 2008, 2013, and 2017

STUDENTS 1992		STUDENTS 2008		STUDENTS 2013		STUDENTS 2017	
Child as a developing organism		**Child as a developing organism**		**Child as a developing organism**		**Child as a developing organism**	
Small tree	1	Seedling	7	Tree	1	Forest tree	1
Seedling	2	Seed	3	Seedling	2	Seedling	2
Mouse	1	Sprout	1	Seed	1	Flower	10
Sheep	1	Flower	1	Roots	1	Squirrel	1
Curious puppy	1	Wild foal herd	1	Flower	5	Wolf puppy	1
Monkey herd	1	Ant	1	Sheep	1	Caterpillar	1
Small tree	1	Caterpillar	1	Puppy	1	Bird	1
	7	Butterfly	1		*13*		*17*
		Fish flock	1				
			17			**Total**	54
Child as friend		**Child as friend**		**Child as friend**		**Child as friend**	
Friend	11	Friend	7	Friend	6	Friend	5
Colleague	4	Colleague	1	Colleague	1		*5*
Small artist	3	Small artist	1	Creative artist	1		
Musician	1		*9*		*8*		
	19					**Total**	41
Child as source of joy		**Child as source of joy**		**Child as source of joy**		**Child as source of joy**	
Toddler/tot/tiny tot	3	Toddler/tot/tiny tot	4	Toddler/tot/tiny tot	4	Own children	2
Clown	1	Pearl	1	Own children	3	Pearl necklace	1
	4	Rough diamond	1	Bringer of joy	1	Sun	1
		Sunshine	1		*8*	Bringer of joy	1
		Apple	1			Various candies	1
			8			Fruit/Apple	1
							7
						Total	27
Child as a passive recipient and a mouldable material		**Child as a passive recipient and a mouldable material**		**Child as a passive recipient and a mouldable material**		**Child as a passive recipient and a mouldable material**	
Robot	1	Sponge	2	Blank paper	1	Sponge	1
Watercolour	1		*2*	Bland board	1	Bland paper	2
Music instrument	1			Textbook	1	Textbook	1
	3			Play-dough	2	Small computer	1
					5	Empty vessel	1
						Play-dough	2
							8
						Total	18
Child as the creator of the new		**Child as the creator of the new**		**Child as the creator of the new**		**Child as the creator of the new**	
Creator of a new	2	Creator of a new	1	Creator of a new	1	Small people	1
Little teacher	1		*1*		*1*		*1*
Small people	1						
	4					**Total**	7
	37		*37*		*35*		*38*
						Child metaphors 147	

APPENDIX 3   Metaphors of student teachers from ECEC centre in 1992, 2008, 2013, and 2017

STUDENTS 1992		*STUDENTS 2008*		*STUDENTS 2013*		*STUDENTS 2017*	
Kindergarten as children's place		***Kindergarten as children's place***		***Kindergarten as children's place***		***Kindergarten as children's place***	
Playground	7	Playground	10	Playground	3	Playground	10
Refuge	1	Safe place	4	safe place	2	Safe place	7
Play place	1	Excursion place	3	Learning place	1	Learning place	2
Decorated space	1	Play place	3	Amusement place	1	Amusement place	2
Flower meadow	1	Fairyland	3	Recliner	1	Fairyland	2
	11	Quiet space	1	Circus	1		*23*
		Ant hill	1	Fairyland	2		
			25	Children's village	1		
				Jungle	1		
				Living village	1		
					14		
						Total	**73**
Kindergarten as home		***Kindergarten as home***		***Kindergarten as home***		***Kindergarten as home***	
Home	7	Home	4	Home	6	Home	7
Another home	1	Another home	2	Another home	2	Another home	11
Safe home	3	Safe home	2	Safe home	1		*18*
Homely space	6		*8*	Grandparent's home	1		
Garden	2			Large home	2		
	19			Warm lap	1		
				Garden	1		
					14		
						Total	**59**
Kindergarten as workplace		***Kindergarten as workplace***		***Kindergarten as workplace***		***Kindergarten as workplace***	
Workplace	7		-	Workplace	5	Workplace	7
Bakery	1				*5*		*7*
	8						
						Total	**20**
Kindergarten as camping site		***Kindergarten as camping site***		***Kindergarten as camping site***		***Kindergarten as camping site***	
Summer camp	4	Camp (summer)	2		-	Camp	6
	4	Summer camp	1			Learning camp	2
		Nature excursion place	1				*8*
		Adventure forest	1				
			5				
						Total	**17**
Kindergarten as school		***Kindergarten as school***		***Kindergarten as school***		***Kindergarten as school***	
Classroom	3	Fine art classroom	1	Classroom	1		-
School	1	School	3	School	1		
Place of information	1		*4*		*2*		
	5						
						Total	**11**

Kindergarten as colourful place		Kindergarten as colourful place		Kindergarten as colourful place		Kindergarten as colourful place	
Watercolour palette	1	Work art	1	Sun	1	Treasure chest	1
	1	Rainbow	1	Spectrum of colours	1	Candy bag	1
			2	Deck of cards	1	Prism	1
					3	Colour chart	1
							4
						Total	**10**
	48		*44*		*38*		*60*
						Kindergarten metaphors 190	