

Who is An Education Supervisor? A Guide or a Nightmare?

By

Türkay Nuri Tok

Educational Faculty, University of Pamukkale, Denizli, Turkey

Abstract

This study conducted in Turkey aims at displaying the perceptions of teacher candidates, trainee teachers, teachers, school administrators, and education supervisors about the concept of "education supervisor" through metaphors. The study group consists of 892 individuals. The study uses content analysis. The participants were asked to complete the statement "An education supervisor is like ... because ...". Among the responses evaluated 387 metaphors were obtained. The metaphors and the themes were described by frequency and percentage calculations. It is seen that most of the participants, other than supervisors, have negative perceptions about supervisors. The most frequently stated metaphors include controller, guide, judge, critic, and nightmare. Supervisors can be trained within the framework of an understanding contributing to the learning process with their expertise and experience rather than being experts, who only advise teachers, criticize and judge them, and state their evaluations.

Keywords: Teacher Candidates, Teachers, Education Supervisors, Metaphor.

1. Introduction

Supervision is the process of directing or guiding people to accomplish the goals of the organization in which they work (Daresh, 1989). Education supervision, on the other hand, is an educational leadership that supports organizational activities, coordinates interaction, enables the continuity and development of the educational program, and evaluates its success in reaching its goals (Krey and Burke, 1989). According to Neagley and Evans (1980), education supervision consists of positive, dynamic, and democratic actions designed to improve teaching, learning, curricula, and all those interested parties. The goal and meaning of supervision has become one of democratic supervision that helps develop teachers' teaching rather than bureaucratic supervision based on control in time also affected by the developments seen in management theories and consequently there has been a shift in the understanding of supervision from control to participation, from evaluation to support (Sullivan and Glanz, 2000).

Supervision has also been defined as the process of monitoring and control of an organization's level of goal materialization (Daresh and Marsha, 1995). This approach on supervision reflects the classical understanding of management that attaches importance to the elements of efficiency, command, and control and that pays attention to the monitoring of the work rather than who does the work and highlights coerciveness (Başar, 1995). This mentality refers to the control of workers by an authority figure in education supervision in the sense that whether they act in accordance with the rules (Acheson and Gall, 1997; Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2004; Sullivan and Glanz, 2000).

The roles and tasks of supervisors

Woods and Jeffrey (2006) state that the situation which places supervisors and teachers in opposing parties result rather from the position of supervisors. Supervisors are in charge of guaranteeing that a government's educational policies be implemented as dictated by their legal duties. Teachers, on the other hand, expect more efficient advisory services from supervisors. Therefore, significant differences may arise between the roles of supervisors and the teachers' expectations from supervisors and their perceptions about education.

Generally, supervision staff is expected to play three yet complementary roles, which are quite evident in the job descriptions: to control and evaluate; to give support and advice; and to act as liaison agents. The

control function covers pedagogical as well as administrative inputs and processes. Obviously, simple control without support will not easily lead to quality improvement. This is why, from the very beginning, these two dimensions of supervision have been intimately linked. Because of two previous functions, which include regular school visits, supervisors are also the main liaison agents between the top of the education system, where norms and rules are set, and the schools, where education really takes places (UNESCO, 2007, p.9). Further, supervisors are expected to demonstrate the attitudes of listening, clarifying, encouraging, reflecting, presenting, problem solving, negotiating, directing, standardizing, and reinforcing respectively while they are carrying out their duties (Glickman et al., 2004).

Supervision system in Turkey

This paper reports on a study done in Turkey. Education policies in Turkey are set by The Ministry of National Education (MoNE). In Turkey, it is the role of ministry supervisors and internal auditors in ministry centers, and education supervisors in each province to get feedback about the problems related to the new system of education and fulfill an effective guidance and supervision of teachers and administrators with a specific purpose to develop and update the education system (Azboz, 2001, p.33).

Ministry supervisors work in central organization on behalf of the Minister. They have the authority to supervise MoNE and secondary educational institutions. Internal auditors work in central organization on behalf of the undersecretary. They can control the activities and the processes of all departments including the Ministry's central, provincial and foreign organizations.

Educational supervisors, the subject of this study, are admitted to the profession following the successful completion of an exam. Those teachers receive at least a four-year education from a higher education institution. Those who pass the exam work as assistant supervisors for 3 years and at the same time they attend supervisor training courses. Those who successfully pass the exams done at the end of these courses receive the title of education supervisor. They work under The Directorate of National Education in each province. They have the authority to supervise education in elementary schools in the provinces (MoNE, 1993, 1999, 2001).

Metaphor: An overview

Metaphor is defined as a figure of speech in which a term is transferred from the object it ordinarily designates to an object it may designate only by implicit comparison or analogy, but the term metaphor is also used as a generic term for all figurative language.” (Long and Lepper, 2008, p.343). Morgan (1998), on the other hand, defines metaphor as way of thinking and seeing that demonstrates how human beings comprehend the world.

According to Ricoeur (1978), a metaphor is the replacement of components associated with the pleasure of understanding following astonishment as well as an artistic and creative strategy of rhetorical attribution (cited in Firat and Yurdakul, 2012). Metaphors enable people to simplify the complex and abstract aspects of their worlds (Farrell, 2006; cited in Eren and Tekinarslan, 2012). Metaphors establish the connection between what we have at hand and others. They have functions like serving as bridges among various experiences, translating knowledge, enabling the apprehension of the outer world according to the nature of metaphorical thinking. They especially transform knowledge from one form into another one (Koro-Ljungberg, 2001). In other words, metaphors are capable of giving us a new understanding of our experience, and thus, can give new meaning to our pasts, to our daily activity, and to what we know and believe; to create realities for us, especially social realities (Lakoff and Johnson, 2005). Metaphors, which are significant instruments that explain the relationship between language and learning, enhance skills of defining new and unknown situations (Woollard, 2004). They demonstrate the whole picture by covering the differences and divisions in little details (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2006).

Inbar (1996) argues that it is possible to achieve non-random and non-superficial information through metaphors. While we are explaining our ideas about an issue we not only display the effects of our past

experiences but also we offer more reliable information since we actively use mental processes at the same time (Northcote and Fetherston, 2006). According to Morgan (1998), and Lakoff and Johnson (2005), metaphors support knowledge and real language and metaphorical language are intermingled. A cognitive process is structured between two subjects by using metaphors. Mental patterns are thus formed. At the end of this process real knowledge is born out of metaphorical knowledge.

Goatly (2002) argues that metaphors about education make it possible for us to comment on education. Therefore, making use of metaphors in order to determine the thoughts of individuals participating in the process of education on the research subject can prove to be an effective method. Northcote and Fetherston (2006) state that individuals generally use metaphors to define their thoughts, perceptions, and individual ideas and metaphors are significant tools in understanding ideas about learning.

2. Literature Review

There studies on the metaphorical perception of education supervisors conducted by Balcı, Demirkasımođlu, Erdoğan and Akın (2011), Bennet (1997), Blumberg and Jonas (1987), Döş (2010), Nolan and Hoover (2005), Parryman (2006, 2007), Reavis (1976), Töremen and Döş (2009), Ünal (2010) and Yıldırım (2012). In the studies by Parryman (2006, 2007), teachers likened supervision to “hell” and developed metaphors that can be used for demoralizing and exhausting situations. In the Reavis’s study (1976) one teacher stated, “We neither fear nor look forward to the supervisor’s observations; it is just something else that interrupts the day, like a fire-drill”. Bennet (1997) related supervision to the marriage metaphor in his study where he compared clinical supervision and the marriage process. In another study by Blumberg and Jonas (1987), the relationship between the supervisor and the teacher was explained by the “pool” metaphor. The authors characterized the classrooms as the teachers’ private pool and defined the supervisors as people who from time to time dive into this pool and swim with the teachers.

The studies show that generally negative metaphors have been used for supervisors. In a study by Töremen and Döş (2009), inspectors were likened to “hunters”, “poplar” and “frame”; and they were likened to “drama critics” in Nolan and Hoover’s (2005) study. In another study by Balcı et al. (2011), teachers used metaphors like “chock”, “ostrich”, “mother-in-love”, and “scarecrow” for supervisors. Other studies also reveal that teachers regard supervisors as people who “look for shortcomings,” and who have “negative critical attitudes” (Yıldırım, 2012) and they are likened to “vultures”, “tigers”, “bears”, and “sergeants” (Ünal, 2010). In Döş’s study (2010), where more positive metaphors have been used regarding supervisors, teacher candidates used metaphors like “guide”, “compass”, and “light.” Supervisors, on the other hand, developed metaphors like “photographer”, “maestro”, “painkillers” (Balcı et al., 2011), “expert”, “researcher”, “detective”, and “aspirin” for themselves (Ünal, 2010).

The goal of the study

The main goal of this study is to reveal the perceptions of teacher candidates, trainee teachers, teachers, school administrators, and education supervisors about the concept of “education supervisor” by means of metaphors. This study sought answers to the following questions in order to fulfill this goal:

1. Which metaphors did participants use describing their perceptions about the concept of “education supervisor”?

2. What are the explanations used for the developed metaphors?

3. Under which themes can these metaphors be categorized regarding their common characteristics?

2. Method

This study is a descriptive study using a survey model conducted in order to reveal the perceptions of teacher candidates, trainee teachers, teachers, school administrators, and education supervisors regarding the concept of “education supervisor” by means of metaphors. This research is realized in 2010-2011 academic year.

Participants

Maximum diversification sampling method was used in determining the study group. The aim of using this sampling method is to show what kind of associations, similarities or differences between the situations that show variations were established (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005). The main goal of qualitative studies is not to offer universal generalizations based on selected samples (Topkaya, 2006). Therefore, this study was conducted using data collected from a working group comprising of senior undergraduate students at Pamukkale University's (PAU) Faculty of Education, Department of Elementary Education, trainee teachers, teachers, and administrators working in primary schools in the central borough of Hatay province and education supervisors working in the same city.

There are a total of 303 senior students at the Department of Elementary Education. All of these teacher candidates were covered by the study. The 296 trainee teachers participating in the study work at primary schools in Hatay province. All the trainee teachers attending the trainee education course have been contacted and consulted. Since it was not possible to reach all the teachers and administrators working at primary schools in the same central borough, 250 teachers and 53 administrators working in selected schools were taken in the study through a random sampling method. Further, an attempt to contact all the educational supervisors in Hatay province was realized but 37 supervisors agreed to participate in the study. Thus, a total of 939 individuals were taken into the framework of the study. Those papers where no specific metaphor was developed, where no logical explanations for a metaphor were offered, or those papers where the participant was obscure about which characteristic she/he wanted to highlight about the supervisor were eliminated. As a result of this process a total of 892 papers were taken into the study, 277 of them belonging to teacher candidates, 285 to trainee teachers, 243 to teachers, 50 to school administrators, and 37 to education supervisors. 47 papers were excluded from the study. Therefore, the working group consists of 892 individuals.

Measures

Data was collected from the study group by requesting them to complete sentences like "Education supervisors are like ... because ...". Metaphors cannot on their own sufficiently reveal the descriptive and visual power of metaphors alone and the questions "why" or "what for" should definitely be asked. The power of metaphors lie in fact in questions regarding these "epithets." Furthermore, each individual can assign different meanings to the same metaphors, therefore, the only way one can understand the differences assigned or the purpose of using a metaphor is to have a response to the "why" question (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005: 213). Thus, we have asked participants to explain the sense in which they use metaphors considering that we can reveal the perceptions about education supervisors in more reliable way.

Data analysis

Content analysis was used in the study. When used properly, content analysis is a powerful data reduction technique. Its major benefit comes from the fact that it is a systematic, replicable technique for compressing many words of text into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding. It has the attractive features of being unobtrusive, and being useful in dealing with large volumes of data. The technique of content analysis extends far beyond simple word frequency counts (Stemler, 2001). The process of analysis and evaluation of the developed metaphors consists of four stages: (1) Naming, coding and eliminating stage, (2) theme development stage, (3) validity and reliability enabling stage, (4) reporting stage.

Naming, coding and eliminating stage. It has alphabetically listed the developed metaphors and explanations made for these metaphors. It has reviewed the explanations and coded the metaphors developed by each participant. The teacher candidates who developed the metaphors were coded as "TC", trainee teachers as "TT", teachers as "T", administrators as "A", and education supervisors as "ES". When having direct citations instead of using the names of the participants codes like A9, T3, etc. (for example A9 refers to the 9th administrator in the crude data texts) were used. Those papers where no

specific metaphor was developed, where no logical explanations for a metaphor were offered, or those papers where the participant was obscure about which characteristic she/he wanted to highlight about supervisors were eliminated. As a result of this process a total of 892 papers were included in the study.

Theme development stage. A total of 387 metaphors were obtained from the evaluated papers. The papers were evaluated several times and the explanations given were assessed, and 5 themes were designated considering the common features of the metaphors (*Nuisance Supervisor Theme, Interrogator Supervisor Theme, Controller Supervisor Theme, Ineffective Supervisor Theme, Guide Supervisor Theme*). The categorization of the metaphors is as follows:

The metaphors developed by participants who regard supervisors as individuals who cause trouble, annoyance, disturbance and who are troublemakers, boring, pains in the head, annoying, nuisance, who make others angry, sad, depressed, who cause them trouble, pose problems or blocks were collected under “Nuisance Supervisor Theme”. The metaphors which stress the judgmental, interrogative, inquisitory sides of the supervisors were collected under “Interrogator Supervisor Theme”. The metaphors about supervisors who are always nitpicking, pedant, captious, controlling, critical, demanding, who always ask for more were collected under “Controller Supervisor Theme”. The metaphors developed by participants who think that supervisors are of no use to the system, they are ineffective, unsuccessful, and shallow individuals who do not improve themselves were collected under “Ineffective Supervisor Theme”. The metaphors developed by participants who regard supervisors as the organizers of the education system and who see them as instructive individuals, as sources of information, as experts, and as directing individuals were collected under “Guide Supervisor Theme”.

Validity and reliability guaranteeing stage. LeCompte and Goetz (1982) point out that the reporting of collected data in detail and the explanation of how the researcher achieved the results are among the most important criteria in a qualitative research for the provision of validation (cited in Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005). The findings of the study, therefore, are presented in detail without adding any interpretation and often by giving direct quotations and are discussed later on in the study. But in cases where the metaphorical statement is too long, only the most important parts of the metaphor were cited preserving the participants’ own words and style.

In order to guarantee the reliability of the results different coders should code the same text in the same way or the same coders should code the same text at different times in the same way (Weber, 1990; cited in Stemler, 2001). Both reliability enabling ways were carried out in this study. Firstly four field experts, who know about qualitative study, were consulted for the reliability of the data in the coding of data, formation of themes out of the codes, and the definition of the themes. The experts were given a list consisting of 387 metaphors developed by the participants in alphabetical order along with a brief explanation and the 5 themes in a random order. The experts were asked to pair 387 metaphors in the first list to the 5 themes in the second list and the pairings done by the experts were then compared to the pairings carried out by the researcher. 24 out of 387 metaphors developed by the participants gave way to disagreements in the comparisons. The responses of the researcher and the experts were compared by Miles and Huberman’s formula (1994) $\text{Agreement}/(\text{Disagreement} + \text{Agreement}) \times 100$ [$363/(24+363) \times 100 = 0.94$] and the reliability of the study was calculated to be 94%. Metaphorical images about the supervisors were categorized under the themes by the researcher and an expert, and a week later this placement was repeated by the same individuals in order to guarantee reliability for the second time and 15 metaphors were seen to be subjects of disagreement. In other words, 96% agreement was maintained. It is seen that both reliability rates were adequate according to Nuendorf’s (2002) criteria.

Reporting stage. The metaphors developed by the participants and the themes established by the researcher were described by frequency and percentage calculations. The percentage of the themes is shown just after the themes themselves in parentheses in the findings section. The figures given in parentheses after the metaphors refer to the number of individuals who had developed the same metaphor

about supervisors. Interesting and different metaphors and explanations were highlighted since it would not be possible to include all the 892 metaphors developed for the study. The metaphors developed and the themes that the metaphors form were also evaluated in the light of the data offered by literature on the subject.

3. Results

The findings regarding the metaphors about how supervisors are perceived by the participants and the themes these metaphors are categorized under are initially offered in this section. Then the ideas of teacher candidates, trainee teachers, teachers, school administrators, and supervisors are handled separately.

General views about education supervisors

About 71% of the participants have a negative perception about supervisors. The metaphors developed are mainly composed of negative analogies. Trainee teachers (86.8%) lead the group of individuals who have negative views. Following trainee teachers come the teachers (82.9%), school administrators (76%), and teacher candidates (47.4%). When the metaphors developed by education supervisors about themselves are studied, it is seen that most of them developed positive metaphors in opposition to the others (78.3%).

The participants mostly developed metaphors about the “nuisance supervisor” theme (39.5%). “Guide supervisor” (20.6%), “controller supervisor” (18.3%), “ineffective supervisor” (13.7%), and “interrogator supervisor” (7.6%) themes follow the first theme respectively. The total number of metaphors regarding education supervisors is 387. The most frequently developed 10 metaphors by the participants are as follows: “Controller (45), guide (37), judge (29), critic (26), nightmare (24), The State Supervisory Council (15), chameleon (13), father (12), mother-in-law (11), dictator (11).

Metaphors developed by teacher candidates and the themes formed by these metaphors

The participants mostly developed metaphors that see the controlling aspect of the supervisors dominant (37%). When these metaphors are studied it is seen that the supervisors are regarded as individuals who mostly look out for mistakes and criticize others. Metaphors about guide supervisor (23%), nuisance supervisor (21%) interrogator supervisor (12%), and ineffective supervisor (6%) themes were developed by the participants. The most frequently developed metaphor by teacher candidates was “controller” (43). Then, the metaphors of "The State Supervisory Council (15)" and "control officer" (10) were used. The metaphors with at least frequency of 3 are: Judges (9), nightmares (7), teacher (7), guide (7), The Council of State (7), dictator (6), questioner (5), The Supreme Court of Appeals (5), municipal police officer (4), The Constitutional Court (4), The Supervisory Body (4), doctor (3), mother (3), traffic police (3), authority (3), parliament (3).

Nuisance supervisor themes. Some of the metaphors developed by teacher candidates and those collected under the nuisance supervisor theme in the light of explanations are: Chameleon (1), mole (1), wolf (1), alarm (1), mixer (1), polygraph (1), quince (1), Azrael (1), monster (1), dread (1), booger (2), hard rock (1), the boss (1), nightmares (7), incubus (2), dictator (6), examination (2), soccer (1), red (1), doomsayer (1), mafia boss (1). The participants have added the following explanations regarding some of these metaphors:

Dictator: *He always wants to have his way regardless of others' ideas.*

Incubus: *The teachers' hearts sink even before they come.*

Mixer: *They just stir the pot and leave.*

Interrogator supervisor themes. The metaphors developed by teacher candidates underlining the investigator-inquisitory, judging identity of the supervisors [detective (2), judges (9), questioner (5), The

Council of State (7), The Supreme Court (5)] were used under this theme. The following explanations were given for some of these metaphors:

Judges: *It feels like he will be judging me any minute.*

Questioner: *A supervisor is a person who asks questions as if to find out a shortcoming.*

Controller supervisor themes. Some of the metaphors developed by the students and categorized under the controller supervisor theme are as follows: Ruler (1), camera (1), radar (2), balance (1), controller (43), critic (2), observer (1), the control officer (10), EU (1), guard (1), mother-in-law (2). The reason why some of these metaphors were developed is explained in the following way:

Controller: *Controls the mistakes and shortcomings of the teacher.*

Mother-in-law: *They want to find out shortcomings. They do not see the useful ones either.*

Radar: *They miss nothing.*

Ineffective supervisor themes. Some of the teacher candidates are of the opinion that supervisors offer nothing useful to the system and that they do not improve themselves. They express these ideas through using metaphors like lamb (1), empty box (1), scarecrow (1), no one (1), summer rain (1), member of parliament (1), chairman (2), opposition party (1), nothing (1), the parliament (3), three dots (1). Explanations regarding some of these metaphors are:

Nothing: *They sound like nothing. I could not learn anything from them.*

Empty box: *They do not use their knowledge for the teacher.*

Guide supervisor themes. The teacher candidates developed metaphors categorized under this theme highlighting the managerial, leadership, teaching, and guiding aspects of supervisors which also point out to the supervisors' role in the organization of the education system. Some of the metaphors developed are: Scavenger fish (1), king bee (1) anti-virus software (2), mirror (1), lantern (1), compass (1) mother (3), master (1), playmaker (1), rainbow (1), protector (1), locksmith (1), scavenger (1), doctor (4), teacher (7), guide (7), light (1), the human heart (1), sweeper (1), traffic police (3), referee (2). Some of the explanations about these metaphors are:

Locksmith: *He solves the source of distress in hard conditions and opens the closed doors.*

King Bee: *It shows other bees the right way to make honey.*

Sweeper: *He removes unnecessary things.*

Metaphors developed by trainee teachers and the themes formed by these metaphors

Trainee teachers mostly developed metaphors around the nuisance supervisor theme (61.4%). This theme is followed by ineffective supervisor (17.1%), guide supervisor (12.9%), controller supervisor (6.6%), and interrogator supervisor (1.7%) themes. The most frequently used metaphor by trainee teachers is "nightmare" (13). The metaphors with at least frequency of 3 are: Guide (11), refrigerator (9) the chameleon (8), air conditioning (5), computer (5), railing (5), mixer (5), mother-in-law (5), robot (5), scarecrow (5), fear (4), cactus (4), bee (3), mirror (3), camera (3), children (3), human (3), bugaboo (3), traffic police (3).

Nuisance supervisor themes. Some teacher trainees regard supervisors as people who are cold, moody, unpredictable, dangerous, stressing, depressing, and scary. Some of the metaphors categorized under the nuisance supervisor are: Octopus (1), owl (1), insects (1), chameleon (8), jellyfish (1), maggot (1), hedgehog (2), snake (1), ox (1), hyena (1), lion (1), lizard (1), base station (1), knife (1), bomb (2), refrigerators (9), castle (1), horror train (1), mixer (5), stick (1), nail file (1), chain (1), cactus (4), monster (3), ghost (1), bugaboo (3), query angels (1), freak (1), alien (2), vampire (1), zombies (1), nausea (1), menstrual pain (2), earthquake (1) storm (1), mafia boss (1), nightmare (13), fear (4), guard (1), executioner (1), dictator (1), king (2), USA (2), love (1), final exam (1). The reasons why some of these metaphors were used were justified in the following way:

Vampire: *They feed on blood.*

Nightmare: *Sleepless nights begin when they tell us that they will be coming in.*

Who is An Education Supervisor? A Guide or a Nightmare?

Menstrual Pain: You relax when it comes and goes back. It creates fear willy-nilly and you understand in fact that fear was of no essence. I think they distress people no matter how good they are.

Interrogator supervisor themes. There are teachers who see supervisors as judgmental. Bench (1), referee (1), officer of law (1), and judge (2) are those metaphors referring to the said line of thought. Some of the explanations regarding these metaphors are:

Judge: *They carry out extrajudicial execution in the classroom and just leave.*

Bench: *It connotes a cold, terrifying object; they are judgmental.*

Controller supervisor themes. Some trainee teachers developed metaphors about supervisors which are used for people who always look out for mistakes, who are critical with never ending requests, and who always want more: Criticism machine (1) magnet (1), children (3), ex-girl friend (1), mother-in-law (5), controller (2), critic (2), municipal police officer (1), EU (1), traffic police (2). Some of the explanations about the developed metaphors are as follows:

Ex-girl friend: *"I want both this and that, it should be like this or that" she says. However, even if you find and bring the gold dust, "Why is its color red instead of white?" she asks.*

Mother-in-law: *Always criticizes everything.*

Critic: *They criticize both the good and the bad.*

Ineffective supervisor themes. Some of the trainees perceive supervisors as individuals who are of no use to the system and who do not improve themselves. Their metaphors reflect this perception: Horse (1), parrots (1), parasites (1), balloon (1), empty box (1), typewriters (1), camera (3), lumber (2), diary (1), gift (1), scarecrow (5), puppet (2), log (1), idol (1) robot (5), tin (1), Pollyanna (1), shepherd (1). Some of the explanations about the developed metaphors are as follows:

Balloon: *I think that they do not possess adequate knowledge about our subject.*

Camera: *Only evaluates the moment it sees.*

Shepherd: *Has no other goal other than herding the sheep.*

Guide supervisor themes. Although low in number, there are teachers who used positive statements about supervisors and refer to them as people who guide and show the right way. Their metaphors include encyclopedias (1), anti-virus software (1), mirror (3), books (2), compass (2), filter (1) scales (1), father (2), tree (1), melon (1), rainbow (1), earth (1), star (1), guide (11), traffic police (1). Some of the explanations about the developed metaphors are as follows:

Filter: *It eliminates the good-bad ones within works.*

Traffic Police: *When he/she arrives at school, everything goes into its right track.*

Metaphors developed by teachers and the themes formed by these metaphors

Teachers mostly developed metaphors around the nuisance supervisor theme (39%). This theme is followed by ineffective supervisor (19.3%), guide supervisor (16.8%), controller supervisor (15.6%), and interrogator supervisor (9%) themes. The most frequently used metaphor by the teachers is "critic (21)". The metaphors with at least frequency of 3 are: Guide (17), guests (7), prosecutors (8), traffic police (7), exam (5), mother-in-law (4), dad (4), detective (4), politician (4), aga (4), chameleon (3), mirror (3), intruder (3), undecided (3), nightmare (3), horror film (3), expert teacher (3), judges (3), dictator (3), exam (3).

Nuisance supervisor themes. Teachers, too, developed mostly negative metaphors regarding supervisors. Some teachers think that supervisors are actually harmful to the system and recollect them through metaphors that mostly call for fear, stress, and distress. Some of the metaphors categorized under this theme are: Vulture (1), chameleon (3), crows (1), hedgehog (1), harvesting (1), hot frying pan (1), citrus reamer (1), nail file (1), intruder (3), stepmother (1), cactus (2), thorn (1), Azrael (1), witch (1) alien (1),

avenger (2), query angels (1), cancer (1) earthquake (1), lightning (1), enemy (1), nightmare (3), hunter (1), thief (2). The following views were offered in order to support these metaphors:

Rasp: *They suppose that they improve us, but in fact consume our lives.*

Azrael: *They always act as if they would take the teacher's life at any second.*

Alien: *They act as if they are from another planet.*

Interrogator supervisor themes. Some of the teachers describe supervisors with their inquisitor, questioning, and judging identities. The metaphors they perceive about this are: scales (1), detective (4), observer (2), referee (1), judges (3), prosecutor (8), interrogation officer (3). They explain their views by the following sentences:

Judges: *They pass verdicts about us, they interrogate and look for shortcomings.*

Prosecutor: *Their only goal is to interrogate.*

Controller supervisor themes. Some of the teachers assigned supervisors the metaphors which are used for vain, rebuke, critical people who are never satisfied [mother-in-law (4), spoiled child (1), cranky child (1), grumpy old man (1), critic (21), inspector (1), traffic police (7)]. Some of the metaphorical expressions used by the teachers while explaining these metaphors are as follows:

Critic: *The only thing they know is to criticize harshly.*

Spoiled child: *Whatever you do, they are never satisfied.*

Grumpy old man: *He complains about everything.*

Ineffective supervisor themes. There are teachers who use metaphors like cicada (1), balloon (1), violin (1), rusty screws (1), robot (2), historical artifact (1), tin (1), legendary character (1), guest (7), summer rain (1), blind guides (1), ineffective element (2), zero (2), wind (1) to refer to their convictions that supervisors are of no use to the education system and that they do not improve themselves. Some of the explanations about these metaphors are as follows:

Guest: *Their evaluations do not concern the process but of daily performance.*

Wind: *Appears suddenly, stays for a couple of hours, and leaves.*

Summer rain: *Comes in, checks the files and just leaves and does not appear until the next year.*

Guide supervisor themes. A very small group of teachers developed metaphors with positive meanings. Those who regard supervisors as sources of knowledge, experts, and guides used metaphors like mirror (3), lighthouse (1), book (2), lamp (1), torch (1), candle (2), father (2) tree (1) earth (1), full moon (1), sky (1), education expert (2), guide (17), saint (1). Some of the explanations about these metaphors are:

Torch: *Is a pathfinder.*

Mirror: *It reflects me to me.*

Earth: *Earth is fertile. Supervisors contribute to education too.*

Metaphors developed by school administrators and the themes formed by these metaphors

Administrators mostly developed metaphors around the nuisance supervisor theme (46%). This theme is followed by guide supervisor (24%), interrogator supervisor (14%), ineffective supervisor (12%), and controller supervisor (4%) Metaphors developed by administrators with a frequency of at least 3 are "prosecutor" (4) and "king" (3).

Nuisance supervisor themes. The metaphors in the nuisance supervisor theme group are: Chameleon (1), fox (2), ice (1), a giant mirror (1), electric heater (1), swords (1), horror tunnel (1), cactus (1), radish (1), Azrael (1), bugaboo (1), monster (1), nightmare (1), king (3), and dictator (1). Some of the statements made by the administrators about metaphors are as follows:

Electric Heater: *It burns you if you get close. It is useless if you move it away.*

Cactus: *You cannot touch any of it; it would prickle your hand.*

Bugaboo: *I feel nervous when they come.*

Who is An Education Supervisor? A Guide or a Nightmare?

Nightmare: *Hearing that they will be coming stresses you out even before they actually come.*

Interrogator supervisor themes. Some participants highlight the investigating identity, which is among the supervisors' roles, of supervisors [detective (1), judges (2) prosecutor (4)]. Some of the metaphorical statements used by administrators to explain the metaphors are as follows:

Detective: *They think that their main task is to look for shortcomings or to find out evil-doers and punish them. And when they find one, it makes them very happy.*

Prosecutor: *It is the position of punishment.*

Controller supervisor themes. Some administrators regard supervisors as people who look for mistakes and criticize others in the light of the mistakes they had found. They used metaphors like review machine (1) and critic (1) to this end. The explanation given regarding the critic metaphor is as follows:

Critic: *Although he also sees the good aspects of the teachers, he finds a mistake and criticizes.*

Ineffective supervisor themes. Metaphors underlining that supervisors do not possess much effectiveness or usefulness are categorized around this theme [closed box (1), modified cars (1) robot (2), live (1), melon (1)]. Some striking metaphorical expressions in this category are:

Modified cars: *They are not really open to changing themselves.*

Robot: *Is the one that cannot renew itself.*

Guide supervisor themes. Some administrators preferred using metaphors highlighting their guiding roles for supervisors: Ant (1), medicine (2), books (1), father (1), North Star (1), guide (1), specialist teacher (1), light (2), and water (1). Some of these descriptions are as follows:

North Star: *Shows you the way.*

Light: *Enlightens what is in the dark.*

Medicine: *Is bitter but useful.*

Metaphors developed by education supervisors and the themes formed by these metaphors

Supervisors mostly developed metaphors around the guide supervisor theme (78.3%). This theme is followed by ineffective supervisor (10.8%), nuisance supervisor (8.1%), interrogator supervisor (5.4%), and controller supervisor (2.7%). The most frequently used metaphors by supervisors are sun (3) and guide (3). The metaphors developed are mostly positive ones.

Nuisance supervisor themes. Supervisors developed metaphors which reflect that they carry out a significant task but this is not properly perceived by others, that they are not much liked because of their tasks, and that sometimes they are being manipulated by others [hot pepper (1), fire tongs (1) the scapegoat (1)]. They explained the reasons why these metaphors were used in the following manner:

Hot pepper: *Everyone scares the person he/she is angry with by hot pepper.*

Fire tongs: *Everyone tries to use them in order to prevent him/herself from getting hurt.*

The scapegoat: *Liked neither by his/her superiors nor by his/her subordinates.*

Interrogator supervisor themes. Some of the supervisors developed metaphors regarding their investigator identities [prosecutor and counselor (1), doctor (1)]. The explanations given, however, show that the guiding and supervision identities of supervisors are also underlined within the scope of the same metaphor.

Prosecutor and counselor: *Corrects the mistakes about the running of schools and investigates. Rehabilitates teachers and administrators.*

Doctor: *First of all he offers guidance very much like preventive medicine services like doctors. He checks whether the preventive service is working or not when he goes to supervise. If the disease gets worse he performs surgery which is the investigation stage. At this stage, he performs all kinds of surgical procedure including the amputation of a gangrenous organ.*

Controller supervisor themes. The school principal (1) metaphor, which is among the metaphors developed by supervisors about themselves, is rendered around the controller supervisor theme. The explanation offered for this metaphor is:

School principal: *Is only a controller.*

Ineffective supervisor themes. The metaphors handled within the scope of this theme are: gendarmerie and security guard (1), teacher (1), dad (1), and ostrich (1). Some statements about the mentioned metaphors are as follows:

Dad: *Works for the good of all but is disregarded by everyone.*

Ostrich: *He both wants to be a bird and a camel but he can neither be a bird neither a camel.* [In Turkish the word ostrich is a combined word (devekuşu) that refers to both camel and bird.].

Guide supervisor themes. Supervisors mostly used metaphors about themselves that carry positive meanings and that highlight their educational, leading, and guiding aspects and also those that show them as people who organize the system. Some of these are: Bee (2), pruning shears (1), lighthouse (1), medicine (1), forest (1), full moon (1) solar (3), parents (1), leader (2), extraordinary man (1), engineer (1), guide (3). Some of the statements made by the supervisors about metaphors are as follows:

Bee: *Carries change and improvement to all flowers.*

Medicine: *Bitter when taken but some time later one sees that it heals.*

Sun: *Enlightens its surrounding. It is the source of energy for the system.*

4. Discussion

Weade and Ernst (1990) state that metaphors are selective and they do not represent the entirety of the phenomenon they attempt to define but only a part of it. In this study, too, the participants underlined the most dominant aspects of supervisors as they see it. Each metaphor may not be adequate enough to define supervisors on its own but the collection of all metaphors will enable us to have a clearer view of how supervisors are being perceived. The findings obtained from the participants about the concept of “education supervisor” calls attention to the following issues:

It is seen that most of the participants covered by the study have negative perceptions about supervisors. Almost all the trainee teachers, teachers, and administrators used negative metaphors about supervisors, while more than half of the teacher candidates and almost all the education supervisors used positive metaphors. Other studies (Balçı et al., 2011; Bennet, 1997; Blumberg and Jonas, 1987; Nolan and Hoover, 2005; Parryman, 2006, 2007; Reavis, 1976; Töremen and Döş, 2009; Ünal, 2010; Yıldırım, 2012) also state that teachers and principals generally use negative metaphors about supervisors, while supervisors themselves use positive metaphors (Balçı et al., 2011; Ünal, 2010).

Trainee teachers, teachers, and administrators developed metaphors mostly around the “nuisance supervisor” theme regarding education supervisors. Teacher candidates mostly used metaphors around the “controller supervisor” theme, while supervisors mostly used metaphors around the “guide supervisor” theme. The most frequently developed metaphors by the participants include controller, guide, judge, critic, and nightmare.

People use metaphors when they do not know much about the concept and terminology of the situation they want to describe because metaphors define the unknown through known experiences (Lakoff and

Johnson, 2005). In the study it is seen that almost half of the teacher candidates' metaphors were negative although they have not had the opportunity to closely know supervisors and although they have not experienced the teacher-supervisor relationship themselves. The candidates' perceptions deriving from their own experiences during primary education, the speculations about supervisors by teachers or administrators they got from the schools they went to for their internship may have been effective on candidates' negative metaphors.

While almost half of the metaphors developed by senior students of the Department of Elementary Education are positive, almost all of the trainee teachers developed negative metaphors. While the students have more positive opinions about supervisors, the fact that trainee teachers, who are just beginning their professions, have such deep changes in their opinions is thought-provoking. The attitudes of supervisors, the ideas and the attitude of teachers or administrators regarding supervisors may have an effect on the change of their thoughts because, looking at the metaphors they produced, it is also seen that almost all of the metaphors are negative. Contrary to the findings of this study, in a study conducted by Döş (2010) it was stated that trainee teachers generally have a positive perception about supervisors. The results of these two studies contradict each other.

Participants other than supervisors think that supervisors have no contribution to the education system and even they are harmful and do not improve themselves. Although rare, there are also supervisors who think that they are not really useful for the system. The metaphors and explanations offered by the participants state that supervisors barely went to schools to supervise and when they did they just stayed for a little while and immediately left. They state that supervisors do not offer enough supervision and that they do not feel that they are backed by the supervisor during the short time they spend time in the schools.

In a study by Töremen and Döş (2009), teachers used metaphors like “unfashioned dress,” “outdated product,” “pimple,” and “cigarette” which put forward the idea that supervisors are not needed. Further, other studies suggest that teachers do not find supervisors experienced and knowledgeable enough and think that they do not renew themselves and therefore they do not offer any contributions to the teachers (Tanrıverdi, 2008; Sümbül and İnandı, 2005; Ünal, 2010; Yıldırım, 2012). Also a study by UNESCO (2007) concludes:

Bitter complaint about supervisors' work further include irregular and bad planning of visits, not enough time spent in the classroom and, at times irrelevant advice. Administrative tasks, which are less crucial but generally more urgent, are given more time than real pedagogical issues. When visiting schools, supervisors spend little time on classroom observation; and when they do, their attitude is more evaluative than supportive (p. 15).

A significant portion of participants state that they are disturbed by supervisors' cold, vain, overbearing, oppressive, authoritative, never satisfied, nitpicking, demanding, inquisitive, and judgmental attitudes. Other studies also yielded similar results. It is not that teachers reject the idea of being supervised; what they dislike is rather the attitude of 'supervisors' (Acheson and Gall, 1997; UNESCO, 2007). Considering that resistance to supervision is a part of human nature (Yılmaz, 2007), the supervisors' focusing on teachers' shortcomings while they offer advice (Ülker and Kaya, 2010; Ünal, 2010; Yıldırım, 2012), their questioning attitudes rather than finding a solution to the teachers' problems (Balci, 2007), and their being like “drama critics” (Nolan and Hoover, 2005) may further add negativity to the views on supervision and supervisors.

Studies state that the teachers want to see supervisors in roles such as “playwright”, “actor”, “producer” and “director” (Nolan and Hoover, 2005), and team coach (Lee, 2011). An ideal supervisor, according to teachers, should professionally be a “guide,” should offer “constructive criticism,” should “know about the field,” should be “motivating,” and “problem solving”; should have an “appropriate physical appearance” and “serious” regarding looks; should be “sophisticated,” “genial,” “open to new things,”

should not be “bossy,” should be “tolerant,” and should have a “vision about the future” regarding attitude and behavior (Yıldırım, 2012). The relationship between the teacher and the supervisor that is similar to that of husband and wife should be based on commitment, truthfulness, trust, respect, communication, cooperation, and understanding. The relationship between the teachers and supervisors, however, is based on a forced trust, respect, communication, cooperation, and understanding (Bennett, 1997).

Some participants stated that they were scared and stressed when they met supervisors and saw them as dangerous people through the metaphors they developed and the explanations they offered for these metaphors. In a study by Parryman (2006), it was stated that “teachers used metaphors such as ‘treadmill’, ‘jumping over hurdles’, ‘jumping through hoops’ ‘a crazy cycle of working like mad followed by a period of near collapse’ ‘continual grind and grind and grind’ and said that ‘the frequency of inspections [was] demoralizing and exhausting’ (p. 11).” Also in another study by Parryman in 2007, teachers likened supervision to “hell” and argue that they felt “beaten” after the stress and oppression during the supervision. Teachers defined supervision as “scary”, “pressurizing”, “dreadful”, “horrible” and “like a nightmare”.

In Turkey supervisors on one hand have the task of offering positive contributions to educators like offering professional help, guidance, and on-job training, they on the other hand have the task of investigating which is not quite in line with these tasks. Although the ultimate task of supervisors should be guidance, they have to approach those people, whom they had offered guidance before, to investigate, to judge, and to propose punitive actions on another day. As Bilgin-Aksu and Mulla, (2009), Kayıkçı and Şarлак, (2009), Taymaz (2010) and Söbü (2005) have stated before, supervisors find themselves in a position where they are experts, guides, rewarders and also punishers, whereas in European Union countries the education supervisors’ tasks are limited to education and administration. The task of investigation is handled by another unit (Özmen and Yasan, 2007). The fact that all these contradicting tasks are carried out by the same individuals is a disadvantage for supervisors because negative experiences are more effective in human memory and they leave scars.

According to the results of the study, some of the participants, including the supervisors, recall supervisors with their interrogator identity. A study by Balcı et al. (2011) also states that metaphors like “meat grinder”, “mill”, “stomachache”, “clamp”, “terminator” were developed connoting this role of supervisors. It should, however, be remembered that supervisors who go to schools for interrogation create an atmosphere of terror (Ülker and Kaya, 2010). One cannot expect positive sentiments to arise in a tense environment. Therefore, another reason why negative metaphors are developed about supervisors may be related to this situation.

There are positive metaphors alongside with negative ones. Especially supervisors used metaphors that show that they have a very important place in the education system. Although they were carrying out such an important task, through their metaphors they underlined that this fact was not adequately noticed either by their superiors or by the supervised; and they were aware of the fact that they were not liked much because of their jobs. Other studies cite supervisors saying that they were doing their jobs in the best way they can (Tanrıverdi, 2008), they were helping the teachers, informing them, and making their jobs easier (Balcı et al., 2011; Ünal, 2010). Supervisors, however, are of the opinion that teachers and administrators do not have a high opinion of them and they had prejudices towards them (Şahin, Çek and Zeytin, 2011), and they were not adopting guidance enough (Sümbül and İnandı, 2005).

Some participants other than supervisors also see supervisors as sources of knowledge, education experts, guides, and organizers of the education system and highlight their teaching, guiding, administrating, and leadership aspects. Other studies also cite teachers who developed positive metaphors and state that they perceive supervisors as “instructive, guiding, and organizing the system.” It is seen that metaphors like

“compass”, “moon”, “parents”, “candle”, “guide” were used in these studies (Döş, 2010; Töremen and Döş, 2009).

Today in many countries control is still considered to be the essential function of supervisors (UNESCO, 2007). Although there has been a shift in the roles of supervisors from controllers to guides in Turkey recently, both the metaphors used in this study and other studies show that the supervisors’ interrogator, authoritative, and critical identities have been more on the foreground than their tasks as guides and that they insist on their tasks as supervision based on control (Açıkgöz, 1990; Memişoğlu, 2007; Ünal and Gürsel, 2007; Yaman, Evcek, and İnandı, 2008 Yavuz, 1995). It is also understood that supervision practices do not transcend pointing out the situation, controlling, and evaluation (Korkmaz and Özdoğan, 2005; Özmen, 2000; Söbü, 2005). Within the scope of this type of supervision, which can be called traditional, the goal of supervision is equivalent to the evaluation of the teacher’s performance. This supervision carried out only to evaluate performance without the teacher’s need result in feelings of anxiety in the supervised and make them regard supervision negatively (Acheson and Gall, 1997), avoid cooperation, block their ability to sincerely reveal their problems to the supervisor, and consequently develop a negative image of the supervisor (Sarpkaya, 2004; Taymaz, 2010).

Woods & Jeffrey (2006) state that supervisors are expected to perform too many tasks in a short time and that this situation decreases the quality of the task performed. Also in the studies by UNESCO (2007), when asked about their main problems, the most common reply of supervisors was excessive workload. In their views, this is because they are often responsible for too many teachers or schools; because they have too many different tasks, many of which have little to do with supervision as such. Supervisors are overburdened with routine administrative tasks, some of which have little or nothing to do with their official job description. Education supervisors in Turkey also have excessive workload and a wide field of tasks (Yıldırım, 2009; Yıldırım, Beycioğlu, Uğurlu and Sincar, 2011). The metaphors developed for this study also demonstrate that supervisors cannot spare enough time for supervision because of their excessive workload. In fact, the expectation of performing many tasks within a limited time will prevent the performance of a task in line with its goals and will increase negativity. This may be a factor in the development of mainly negative metaphors about supervisors.

Consequently, all these reasons may have been affecting the development of negative metaphors by participants other than supervisors. Unfortunately one can say that negative attitudes towards supervisors still continue as they did in the past. Individuals can be informed about the goals, necessity, and benefits of supervision in order to eliminate these problems. Opportunities that will enable teacher candidates during their education, and teachers and administrators during their tenures to meet and get to know supervisors can be created. Removing the task of interrogation from education supervisors and establishing a distinct interrogation unit for this task should be considered. Thus, supervisors can spare more time for their fundamental tasks like professional guidance and on-the-job training. In-service training sessions for supervisors can be held on subjects like human relations and communication skills. Supervisors can be trained within the framework of an understanding that contributes to the education process with expertise and experience and not only as experts who advise, criticize, judge, and evaluate teachers.

References

- Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1997). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Açıkgöz, K. (1990). The levels of practicing modern supervision activities by elementary school supervisors working in the provinces of Malatya, Mardin, and Diyarbakır and the problems seen in the process of supervision. *Malatya: Inonu University Research Report*.

- Azboz, M. E. (2001). Supervision: The other dimension of education. *Education and Supervision*. May, 5.
- Balçı, A. (1995). *Research in Sosial Science*. Ankara: 72 TDFO Bilgisayar-Press.
- Balçı, A. Demirkasımoğlu, N., Erdoğan, Ç. & Akın, U. (2011). Turkish teachers' and supervisors' metaphorical perceptions about supervisors. *Educational Research*. 2(10), 1602-1610. Retrieved from <http://interesjournals.org/ER/pdf/2011/October/Balci%20et%20al..pdf>
- Balçı, B. (2007). *The perceptions of education supervisors and primary school principals related to the education supervisors' levels of performing the role of guidance*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Başar, H. (1995). *Education supervisor*, Ankara: Pegem.
- Bennett, T. (1997). *Clinical supervision marriage: a matrimonial metaphor for understanding the supervisor-teacher relationship*. (ED408246) Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>.
- Bilgin-Aksu, M., & Mulla, E. (2009). Human relations competencies of primary supervisors. *1. Educational Supervision Congress with International Participation, 23-23 June 2009*, 387-395. Ankara: TEM-SEN.
- Blumberg, A., & Jonas, R. S. (1987). The teacher's control over supervision. *Educational Leadership*, 44(8), 58-62.
- Daresh, J. (1989). *Supervision as a proactive process*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Daresh, J. C. & Marsha A. P. (1995). *Supervision as a proactive process*. New York: Waveland Press.
- Döş, İ. (2010). Metaphoric perceptions of candidate teachers to the concept of inspectors. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*. 9(3), 607-629.
- Eren, A. and Tekinarslan, E. (2012). Prospective Teachers' Metaphors: Teacher, Teaching, Learning, Instructional Material and Evaluation Concepts. *International Journal of Social Science. & Education*, (3)2, 435-445.
- Fırat, M. and Kabakçı, Yurdakul, I. (2012). University Metaphors: A Study of Academicians' Perspectives. *International Journal of Social Science. & Education*, (2)2, 194-206.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2004). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goatly, A. (2002). Conflicting metaphors in the Hong Kong special administrative region educational reform proposals. *Metaphor and Symbol*. 17(4), 263-294. doi.org/10.1207/S15327868MS1704_2.
- Hoy, W. K., & Forsyth, P. B. (1986). *Effective supervision: Theory into practice*. New York: Random House.
- Inbar, D. (1996). The free educational prison: metaphors and images. *Educational Research*, 28,77-92.
- Karasar, N. (2002). *Scientific research method*. Ankara:Nobel.
- Kayıkçı, K., & Şarlak, Ş. (2009). Organizational obstacles that complicate and weaken the effective performance of supervision in elementary schools. *1. International Educational Supervision Congress. 23-23 June 2009*, 127-135. Ankara: TEM-SEN.
- Korkmaz, M., & Özdoğan, O. (2005). According to primary teachers, evaluation of the supervisors' levels of realizing roles. *Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 3(4), 431-443.
- Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2001). Metaphors as a way to explore qualitative data. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(3), 367-379. doi:10.1080/09518390110029102.

- Krey D. & Burke, P.J. (1989). *A design for instructional supervision*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2005). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, Y.A. (2011). Self-study of cross-cultural supervision of teacher candidates for social justice. *Studying Teacher Education*. 7(1), 3-18. doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2011.558341.
- Long P. S. & Lepper, G. (2008). Metaphor in psychoanalytic psychotherapy: A comparative study of four cases by A practitioner–researcher. *British Journal of Psychotherapy*. 24(3), 343–364. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0118.2008.00090.x.
- Memişoğlu, S. P. (2007). The supervision of information technology classrooms in Turkey: A nationwide survey. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 23(4), 529-541. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet23/memisoglu.html>.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (1993). *Supervision council board regulation*. Retrieved from <http://tkb.meb.gov.tr>.
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (1999). *Supervisors in primary education council boards regulation*. Retrieved from <http://www.meb.gov.tr>.
- Ministry of National Education [MoNE]. (2001). *Supervision in primary education council boards guidance and counselling directive*. Retrieved from <http://www.meb.gov>.
- Morgan, G. (1998). *Metaphor in administration and organization theories*. G. Bulut (Ed.). İstanbul: TMSS.
- Neagley, L. & Evans, H.D. (1980). *Handbook for effective supervision of instruction*. Engle-wood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- Nolan J, Hoover L.A. (2005). *Teacher supervision and evaluation*. USA:John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Northcote, M. & Fetherston, T. (2006). New metaphors for teaching and learning in a university context. *HERDSA 2006 Conference Proceedings*. 251-258.
- Nuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Olivia, P.F. & Pawlas, G.E. (2001). *Supervision for today's school*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Özmen, F. & Yasan, T. (2007). Supervision in Turkish educational system and benchmarking with eu countries. *Research in Eastern Anatolia Region*.
- Özmen, F. (2000). The views of supervisors in the frame of the premises of clinical Supervision. *Firat University Journal of Social Science*. 10(1), 119-157, Elazığ.
- Perryman, J. (2006). Panoptic performativity and school inspection regimes: Disciplinary mechanisms and life under special measures. *Journal of Education Policy*. 21(2), 147-161. doi.org/10.1080/02680930500500138.
- Perryman, J. (2007). Inspection and emotion. *Cambridge Journal of Education*. 37(2), 173-190. doi.org/10.1080/03057640701372418.
- Reavis, C. A. (1976). Clinical supervision: A timely approach. *Educational Leadership*. 33(5), 360-366.
- Sarpkaya, R. (2004). The problems faced by the primary school inspectors during the supervision. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty*, 5(8), 114-129.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starrat, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Springfield.

- Söbü A. (2005). *Problems of primary school inspectors*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Cumhuriyet University, Sivas.
- Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(17). Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=17>.
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). *Supervision that improves teaching: strategies and techniques* (2th. ed.). California: Corwin Press.
- Sünbül, Ö. & Y. İnandı. (2005). A scale development study for determining primary and secondary school teachers' attitudes towards primary and ministry inspectors *Mersin University Journal of Education Faculty*, 1(2), 214-226.
- Şahin, S., Çek, F. & Zeytin, N. (2011). Professional contentment and discontentment of the education supervisors. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*. 7(2), 221-246.
- Tanrıverdi, L. (2008). *The analysis of exhaustion levels and job satisfaction of primary school inspectors (İstanbul sample)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Taymaz, H. (2010). *Inspection, concepts, principles, methods in education system*. Ankara: Pegema.
- Topkaya, E. Z. (2006). Yıldırım, Ali and Şimşek Hasan Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences Updated 5. edition, Ankara: Seçkin Publishing, 2005, 366 pp. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*. 2(2), 113-118.
- Töremen, F. & İ. Döş. (2009). The metaphoric perceptions of primary school teachers on the concept of inspection. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*. 9(4), 1999-2012.
- UNESCO (2007). *Roles and functions of supervisors*. Retrieved July 28, 2011 from www.unesco.org/iiep.
- Ülker, Y. & Kaya, S. (2010). Determining teachers' views on elementary school supervisors' roles of guidance, evaluation, and interrogation. *II. International Educational Supervision Congress. 23-25 June 2010*. Kütahya.
- Ünal, A. (2010). Analysis of perception on supervisors in primary education. *Procedia Social And Behavioral Sciences*. 2, 5028-5033.
- Ünal, A., & Gürsel, M. (2007). Evaluation of primary school inspectors concerning of learning organization. *Selçuk University Journal of the Institute Social Sciences*. 18, 463-482.
- Weade, R., & Ernst, G. (1990). Pictures of life in classrooms, and the search for metaphors to frame them. *Theory into Practice*, 29 (2), 133-140.
- Woods P. & Jeffrey B. (2006). Choosing Positions: living the contradictions of OFSTED. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 19(4): 547-570.
- Woollard, W.J. (2004) *The rôle of metaphor in the teaching of computing: towards a taxonomy of pedagogic content knowledge*. University of Southampton, School of Education, (Doctoral Thesis), 167pp. <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/11227>
- Yaman, S., Evcek, E., & İnandı, Y. (2008). Inspection in elt: The attitudes of English language teachers towards inspectors. *Cukurova University Journal of Education Faculty*, 3(35), 38-49.
- Yavuz, Y. (1995). *Teachers' evaluation of supervision practices in the light of clinic supervision principles*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University. İzmir.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2005). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences*. Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.

Who is An Education Supervisor? A Guide or a Nightmare?

- Yıldırım, M. C. (2009). *Evaluating the teacher supervision practices at primary schools in terms of constructivist learning paradigm principles*. (Unpublished doctorate thesis). Inonu University, Malatya.
- Yıldırım, M. C., Beycioğlu, K., Uğurlu, C. T. & Sincar, M. (2011). The problems encountered in tasks areas of education supervisors. *III. Educational Supervision Congress with International Participation, 22-23 June 2011*. (483–497). Ankara: Sözkesen Press.
- Yıldırım, N. (2012). A comparative study of education supervisor and ministry supervisor images. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*. 18(1), 143-166.
- Yılmaz, A. (2007). *The relationship between elementary education supervisors' carrying out their professional tasks and their level of burnout*. (Unpublished doctorate thesis). Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.