Full length Research Paper

Turkish teachers' and supervisors' metaphorical perceptions about supervisors

Ali Balcı, Nihan Demirkasımoğlu, Çetin Erdoğan and Uğur Akın*

Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Administration and Policy, 06590 Çankaya, Ankara / TURKEY

This study examined the metaphorical perceptions of Turkish elementary school teachers regarding supervisors and those of supervisors regarding themselves. The study has been conducted as a qualitative research. The data were gathered through two separate focus group studies and analyzed by content analysis technique. Results of the study show that there is considerable difference between metaphorical perceptions of teachers and supervisors about supervisors. While teachers describe supervisors with such metaphors as *"photographer", "robot", "mother-in-law" and "fault hunter",* supervisors describe existing supervisors as *"walking stick", "tong" "player", and "executioner".* This study is expected to identify and offer solutions for the failures, barriers and problems in teacher – supervisor relationships during the process of supervision.

Keywords: Supervisor metaphors, supervisors, metaphors, metaphorical perceptions, teachers.

INTRODUCTION

In the traditional sense, supervision in education was thought to check the final product at the final stage and find out teachers' faults in their classrooms to eliminate those who diverted from the regulations and standards (Daresh, 2001, p.4). In the contemporary approach of education, supervision is based on the philosophy of training and improving. With this understanding, supervisors have adopted the image of counselor and guide. Contemporary approach of education emphasizes that supervision involves participation, research and evaluation. In this approach, supervisors have to enable teachers to understand the aims related to education by themselves, which could be attained by adopting the role of a counselor (Aydın, 1986, pp.6-19). In this sense, supervision requires the involvement of teachers in the educational dialogues with the purpose of increasing student success and improving education (Sullivan and Glanz, 2000, p.24). This purpose will be achieved by

making teachers feel that they were important to the school by showing interest in them as people (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 2007, pp.14-16). It was empirically shown that the teachers thought they needed to cooperate with supervisors during the supervision process (Florence, 2005). According to the teachers, an ideal supervisor should be competent on human relations such as complying with confidentiality, being unprejudiced and open minded, having effective communication skills including listening, sensitivity and courtesy skills and having sense of humor (Nolan and Hoover, 2005, p.51).

Supervisors' strong adherence to hierarchy and authority may result in their negligence of human relations. According to Woods and Jeffrey (1998), for the sake of hierarchy and authority, which are thought to be necessary to attain their aims, supervisors tend to keep a distance with teachers while in contact with them. However, such a distance requires supervisors to adopt a strict image. Also, supervisors tend to think that they are losing their power and authority and they feel fear, anxiety and alienation, thinking that they need to be displaying strict discipline constantly (Perryman, 2007).

---

*Correspondig author E-mail: uurakin@hotmail.com, Phone: +90 312 363 33 50 / 3022, Fax: +90 312 363 61 45

Blumberg's (1974) historical analysis about the professional relation between teachers and supervisors follows the same line with the arguments above. He defines this relation as a negative and difficult one which is hard to tolerate.

Supervisors in Turkish Educational System

In the Turkish education system, supervision of secondary schools is carried out by ministerial supervisors who are directly under the control of the Ministry of National Education, while supervision of primary schools is fulfilled by education supervisors who are under the supervision of provincial directorates for national education. In primary school supervision, the focus of the research, although principals have the authority and the task of supervision, it is mostly carried out by education supervisors. Supervisors who are obliged to supervise provincial state and private primary schools are to supervise each school every two years (Turkish Ministry of Education Regulation of Elementary Supervisors' Directorship, 1999).

Turkish education system assigns four main roles to education supervisors which are investigator-researcher, counselor and guide, controller, and interrogator. According to related legislation (Turkish Ministry of Education Regulation of Elementary Supervisors' Directorship, 1999) these roles could be explained briefly as follows.

Guidance: Guiding in solving the educational, instructional and administrative problems of schools, guiding the professional development of teachers.

Control: Controlling whether or not educational activities operate consistent with the determined goals and laws.

Investigator-Researcher: Analyzing the problems related to educational, instructional and administrative activities and researching it when it is necessary.

Interrogation: Inquiring the situation upon the directives of governorship within the related legislation in public and private institutions.

Unlike contemporary applications in the world, supervisors also have a role of interrogator in the Turkish supervision system, which conflicts with the role of counselor. Such a role conflict greatly hinders the establishment of positive relations between supervisors and those who go under supervision.

The Use of Metaphors in Supervision

Metaphors have a considerable place in one's conceptual structure (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.103). Metaphor is

"one's style of thought and view that influences his understanding the world" (Morgan, 1997, p.14). Metaphors open a new door to interpret complexity and abstraction from a different perspective, and help certain features to be transferred from the known context to the unknown one (Balcı, 1992). According to Ortony (1977), metaphors enrich the meaning and the reader feels pleased to have discovered the underlying meaning. The power of metaphor to explain phenomena and events, its role to organize information and to enlighten an event are all obvious facts (Clarken, 1997, p.2).

Considering the educational administration literature, it is understood that metaphors are used to assess, orally or symbolically, the organizational structure of the school, to explain and analyze the behavior of managers, to evaluate the roles of managers, to conceptualize school and to analyze and understand the organizational structure of the school (Balcı, 1999). It is seen that metaphors used as a descriptive means to analyze, understand and conceptualize various terms of education and teaching are also applied for defining teacher-supervisor relations. Blumberg and Jonas (1987) define teacher-supervisor relations with the metaphor of *"pool"*. Accordingly, classrooms are like teachers' private pools. Supervisors need to be accepted by teachers if they are to swim together with teachers in those pools. According to the authors, supervisors can visit classrooms. However, if such a visit is to go beyond a ritual, it is essential for teachers to psychologically recognize supervisors. Bennet (1997) explains the relation between teacher and supervisor with "marriage metaphor", comparing the relation between teacher and supervisor to the relation between husband and wife. He highlights such common features as interest, faithfulness, communication, respect, honesty and integrity while comparing the clinical supervision and marriage processes. Glickman (1990, pp.4-5) explains supervision at school with the metaphor of "glue" since it has the function of combining various factors of effective education. This 'glue' is the supervision, which is a process that combines the individual needs of teachers and organizational goals of the school, enabling teachers to work in harmony. Perryman (2006) noted that teachers describe supervisors with the metaphor of *"panoptic"*. According to Perryman, teachers claim that supervisors are continuously scrutinizing them and supervisions are done too frequently. In a different study, teachers define the supervision process with such metaphors as *"running on the treadmill"*, *"hurdling"*, *"jumping through a burning hoop"* and *"working crazily until getting exhausted"*. It is concluded in Perryman's study (2007) that continuous supervision turns the work environment of teachers into *"hell"*. In the same study, a teacher reported that he feels himself as if he were *"beaten"*, which results from too

much work and stress during supervisions. Similarly, in this study, those who are inspected define their supervision experience as "*scary*", "*pressurizing*", "*dreadful*", "*horrible*" and "*like a nightmare*". According to Erdem (1988, p.28; cited in Taymaz, 2005, p.59), the nature of supervision involves comparing the current application with the previously planned or ideal application and finding errors, failures and diversions; in a way, it is like "*chasing for faults*". Therefore, supervisors are described as "*fault hunters*". The ideal and desired condition is that these faults do not exist at all or exist at the lowest possible level. Faults and diversions have to be determined to improve the teaching that is being offered.

On the other hand, teachers view supervision as "a process when they need to display the best they can do so as to gain appreciation of the supervisor". During this process, the supervisor is seen as a "*drama critic*" whereas teachers are believed to have the roles of a "*playwright*", "*actor*", "*producer*" and "*director*" (Nolan and Hoover, 2005, p.34).

Based on the literature discussed above briefly, it is understood that although there are studies related to supervision procedure and perceptions regarding supervisors (e.g. Blumberg and Jonas, 1987; Glickman, 1990; Bennet, 1997), and studies about the metaphorical perception of teachers regarding supervisors (e.g. Nolan and Hoover, 2005; Florence, 2005; Perryman, 2006; Perryman, 2007; Pizzi, 2009; Döş, 2010). This study, with the aim of determining teachers' metaphorical perceptions of supervisors as well as supervisors' metaphorical perceptions of themselves, is expected to contribute to the field of educational supervision, which has not been studied much so far. Furthermore, these metaphorical perceptions are thought to have a significant function in order to identify the failures, barriers and problems during the process of supervision and to reinforce the positive aspects. Consequently, this study aims at finding answers to the research questions listed below:

1.   How do teachers metaphorically describe a supervisor?
2.   How do supervisors metaphorically describe a supervisor?
3.   What are the similarities and differences between metaphorical perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding supervisors?

METHODOLOGY

This study has been conducted as a qualitative research. In this qualitative study, focus group discussion is used as data gathering tool as it enables researchers to benefit from knowledge and experience of participants through group interactions (Kitzinger, 1995).

The participants comprise 10 teachers employed at public elementary schools in Ankara and 8 elementary school supervisors. The data were gathered through two separate focus group studies, each made up of teachers and supervisors separately. While choosing the teachers and supervisors to participate the focus group interview, supervision experience has been considered as the base, and the criteria while choosing the participating teachers have been the length of service in the profession and having had minimum two supervisions during professional life; for supervisors, the criterion has been minimum two supervision experiences. Professional experience of the teachers in the study is between 5 to 18 years, and it is 14 to 23 years for supervisors.

Instrument and Procedure

An interview form has been developed for focus group interviews. Interview questions have been prepared in accordance with four basic roles of supervisors mentioned above. When the literature and legislation related to Turkish education system is taken into account, supervisors are expected to be responsible for four different roles, each stemming from their assigned duties (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], Legislation for the Board of Elementary Education Supervisors, Clause, 5; Taymaz, 2005, p.47). These roles are defined as "investigator-researcher", "counselor and guide", "controller" and "interrogator". These four main roles have been taken as the base in the interviews while determining the metaphors regarding supervisors. Both interviews lasted about 90 minutes which is within the suggested time range (Balcı, 2010; Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005) for focus group interview technique. The data were analyzed by content analysis technique.

As related to external validity, analytical implications are made by focusing on the examples and experiences of metaphorical perceptions regarding supervisors.

Triangulation, participant test and colleague test were applied as related to internal validity (Merriam, 1998, p. 204). Within the scope of triangulation strategy, various metaphorical perceptions regarding supervisors have been taken into consideration with the attempt of revealing all aspects of metaphorical perceptions related to supervisors by bringing various opinions in the foreground. Within the scope of the participant test, research results were presented in a meeting which the teachers and supervisors in the study participated, and participants expressed their positive views about the accuracy and acceptability of the research results. Regarding the colleague test, the academicians were

consulted for their approval about the validity and acceptability of research results, and positive views were reported.

For internal reliability, the analysis carried out by individual researchers independently using the same data was compared, and the analysis results were observed to be consistent. External reliability was obtained by providing detailed information about the process of collecting and analyzing data, as well as giving a detailed account of the participants.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Investigator-Researcher Role

Teachers describe supervisors with the following metaphors: *"chock", "balloon", "photographer"* and *"robot".* Teachers use the metaphor *"chock"* to mean that supervisors act as barriers for work to be done, *"balloon"* to imply that they are shallow, "*photographer*" to refer to their revealing everything as it is, and "*robot*" to indicate that they fulfill their responsibilities mechanically. Some statements including these metaphors are as following:

- *A chock has a simple function, which is to prevent. It is carved by someone else and can do only a defined task. Before being sent to a duty, supervisors are told what to inspect and what the expected outcomes are. Without considering the unique conditions of the case, supervisors try to cover the steps of the assignment to be done.*

- *Current supervisors are like photographers. They simply capture the existing condition and let it remain so.*

- *Supervisors are like a robot. They complete their task and then go back.*

Considering investigator-researcher role of supervisors, teachers perceive them as doing their work mechanically and they claim that supervisors think they know the best, being officious rather than making things easier. It seems that there is a deviation between what supervisors perform and what is expected from them.

Supervisors define themselves by using the metaphors *"walking stick*", "*photographer*", "*tong*" and "*cover*". The metaphors of "*walking stick", "photographer*", "*cover*" and "*tong*" are being used to execute the obnoxious work not desired to be done by the upper administration. Also, the "*photographer*" metaphor refers their reflecting the existing case as it is. Some statements of supervisors are as following about the mentioned metaphors:

- *Role of supervisors in executing the works and functions of the system may be compared to a walking stick. Administrators depend on and use supervisors to get their work done.*

- *Supervisors may be compared to photographers as they reflect the existing condition as it is.*

- *Administrators use supervisors as a cover for what they should be doing. Reports of supervisors are put forward and administrators remain in the background, so the obnoxious aspect is attributed to the supervisors.*

Supervisors view themselves as individuals who are in charge of finding remedies for undesirable and obnoxious tasks, reflecting the existing situation as it is just like a photographer. Thus, supervisors seem to be well aware of their responsibilities as an investigator-researcher.

On the other hand, teachers think that supervisors disrupt the work done and generally officious. Supervisors are also thought to perform their duty mechanically while revealing the case as it appears. Teachers describe these perceptions with the metaphors of "*chock", "balloon", "photographer"* and *"robot*". Supervisors, on the other hand comment that, they are used to perform the undesirable and obnoxious works which are avoided by the higher level administrators, reflecting the existing case as it is using the metaphors of *"walking stick", "cover"* and *"photographer".* In conclusion, there is a similarity between the perceptions of teachers and supervisors in this dimension. Both teachers and supervisors use the metaphor of *"photographer*" for the same reason. Also, the "*robot*" metaphor used by teachers refers to executing the task assigned, and the metaphors of "*walking stick*" and *"tong"* used by supervisors to refer to doing the work of others can be used as an evidence for this similarity.

Counselor and Guide Role

Teachers describe supervisors by the metaphors of "*ostrich", "parrot", "worn battery", "mosquito", "despot parents"* and *"mould*". Teachers emphasize that supervisors are too incompetent and too obsessed to function as an efficient counselor. Teachers use the metaphors of *"ostrich"* and *"worn battery"* to refer to the fact that supervisors remain blind to the problems and can hardly help teachers. *"Parrot", "mosquito"* and *"mould"* metaphors are used to indicate that supervisors are so obsessed and so strict with the legislation that they do their job as a routine. *"Despot parents"* metaphor is used to explain that supervisors dictate their views and suggestions. Some of the metaphorical expressions used by the teachers while explaining these metaphors are as following:

- *They remain blind to the problems, only appearing as if they were solving the problem; that is, they bury their head in the ground like an ostrich.*

- *I think supervisors are more like a parrot. They*

have memorized the legislation, and keep repeating it just like a parrot. Under no condition, do they consider any other alternative or possibility.

- *Supervisors are like moulds since my image of a supervisor is the one who never welcomes different ideas, considering events only from his own frame of mind.*

- *I see supervisors as despot parents. They put obstacles into someone's way and generally create problem.*

Teachers' negative metaphorical perceptions about supervisors such as "*strict", "trying to impose their own view"* and *"obsessed"* obviously make it difficult for supervisors to function as a counselor and guide. Similar to the findings, a study on teacher-supervisor relations by Obilade (1992) concluded that teachers and supervisors did not like one another; they could not mutually develop sincere relations or trust and had trouble in open communication. In the study, it was observed that the teachers considered supervisors as dictators, fault finders, superiors who bullied or blustered teachers and individuals who deemed themselves as authorities in the field. Most of the teachers disagreed that supervisors acted as colleagues or friends. They also expressed that they were not affected by supervisors' evaluations.

It can be concluded that supervisors have to be patient and tolerant in their relations with teachers without forgetting courtesy and tolerance so as to get rid of the negative image of supervisors which results from these perceptions. These findings resemble the "*marriage*" metaphor in Bennet's study (1997) to explain the relationship between teachers and supervisors. Using marriage metaphor, Bennet compares the relationship between teachers and supervisors to that between husband and wife to emphasize that good communication, respect and loyalty have to be found in both parties in order to have a successful and beneficial relation between both.

On the other hand, supervisors describe supervisors with the metaphors of *"maestro", "white light",* "*projector*", *"player", "county constabulary"* and *"leverage".* Supervisors state that they are generally supposed to inspect all different subjects/courses, including those which are not within their field of their expertise. They use the metaphors "*maestro*" to describe their supervising both classes in various fields and the administrators; "*white light*" to refer to their counseling assignment in every different field and "*projector*" to explain that they are supposed to enlighten every different field. Supervisors admit that they behave as if they were executing these tasks like a "*player*". Also, supervisors use the metaphor of "*leverage*" to describe their having to carry the supervision task, which is a hard and heavy burden; *"county constabulary"* to refer to having to

administer the chaos in education without taking the problems to their superiors. In Döş's research, (2010), the *"county constabulary*" and "*maestro"* metaphors are used by candidate teachers to describe the supervisors with similar reasons. Some of the metaphorical statements used by supervisors to explain the metaphors are as following:

- *Like a player, I do the work assigned as if I were doing it.*

- *There is a burden, a problem which needs to be lifted. We are like leverage used to lift and carry that burden so as to eliminate the problem.*

- *Our counseling work can be compared to the work of a maestro. We need to do counseling both to the administrators and to teachers in various fields.*

Teachers claim that they cannot benefit from the supervisors sufficiently and supervisors state that they cannot be satisfactorily useful in certain subject courses. In other words, teachers complain about supervisors' being insufficient and obsessed, behaving in a despot manner while supervisors claim that the current system put a heavy load on them, complaining about being obliged to inspect the classes which are not within their field of expertise. This finding clearly emphasizes that supervision of a certain course has to be done by the supervisors who are qualified and experienced in that course. For example, an English or Mathematics teacher at an elementary school sometimes could be supervised by a supervisor who is not competent in these courses.

Controller Role

Teachers' metaphorical perceptions about the controller role are "*mother-in-law", "fault hunter", "politician", "sports critic", "civil servant"* and *"detective*" in this dimension. Teachers emphasize that what supervisors mainly do is look for faults and insufficiency of teachers, and therefore, use the metaphors of *"mother-in-law",* "*fault hunter*" and *"detective"* in this respect. They also state that supervisors comment far too much and require teachers to accomplish what in reality they cannot, so they explain this case with the metaphors of "*sports critic"* and *"politician*". Thinking that supervisors overemphasize the legislation and remain obsessed with it, teachers describe supervisors with the metaphor of "*civil servant*". Some striking metaphorical expressions in this dimension are below:

- *Supervisors look for faults. They always find a reason to criticize. That's why; I resemble them to mother-in-law in the old times.*

- *Supervisors are like sports critics, who did not play well in the past, but now criticize everyone bitterly.*

On the other hand, supervisors describe their role as a

controller with the metaphors of *"detector"*, *"detective"*, *"painkiller"*, *"rapporteur"* and *"artist"*. Referring to their looking for and finding problems and faults of teachers, supervisors describe themselves with the metaphors of *"detector"* and *"detective"*. Considering their revealing the failures and problems openly, they resemble themselves to a *"rapporteur"* and "*artist*". They use the "*painkiller*" metaphor to describe their finding short-term remedies rather than providing lasting solutions. Some statements of supervisors in this dimension are as following:

- *I think supervisors are like detectives because they are always looking for failures. We go to schools and say do this, do that, and then go away. We are also labeled as 'unauthorized agents' in discernment decisions.*

- *Supervisors are like rapporteurs in the sense that they take the camera, capture the scene like a security camera, and turn it over to the authorities. The upper level management decides for the rest. We only submit the report.*

- *I believe supervisors are actually like painkillers in the sense that they create immediate solutions to the problems to relieve them temporarily.*

Teachers feel that supervisors try to find their failures and wrong actions, adding that supervisors say too many things and expect teachers to accomplish what even themselves cannot do. Supervisors' obsessive attitudes about the legislation are also noted by the teachers. Supervisors describe themselves as those finding and revealing the problems and failures of teachers and those who suggest temporary solutions to the problems rather than offering permanent solutions, adding that they approach teachers with a paternalist attitude. In this dimension, there are differences between the perceptions of teachers and supervisors. Teachers claim that supervisors look for and find their faults in order to persecute teachers while supervisors claim that the reason for their looking for faults is to introduce corrective measures. A study by Döş (2010) supports teachers' views about supervisors. Similarly, in this study, the teachers considered supervisors as *"police officers"* who audited business documents, *"detectives"* who went into details, *"detectors"* who hunted teachers' faults and *"electrical fuse"* or *"neon-testers"* who played the role of operational controller. In the same line in Erdem's (1988, p.28; cited in Taymaz, 2005, p.59) and in Obilade's (1992) studies supervisors are described as "*fault hunters*".

Supervisors as a controller are claimed to be obsessed with the legislation and to oppress teachers by criticizing them bitterly. They are also thought to expect teachers to accomplish what they cannot do themselves, always trying to find faults of teachers. These findings are parallel to Perryman's (2006) in which teachers identified

supervisors with "*panoptic*" metaphor to refer to their being continuously kept under surveillance and pressure by supervisors. In another study, Perryman (2007) focused on repressive and negative image of supervisors, stating that supervision period turns professional life of teachers into "*hell*".

Control is an indispensible part of supervision and it is essential to supervise teachers' work and practices, but excessive control or too close control might have negative effects on teachers (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2007, 43). It is obvious that close control which is frequently applied to find teachers' faults or to punish teachers does not serve the purpose of supervision. In this study, the teachers expressed that they were irritated by misapplied control. In this context, application of excessive control or too close control according to certain standards or rules became a method criticized by teachers. In a study by Pizzi (2009), it was shown that teachers were dissatisfied with the standard based teacher evaluation system. They thought that such evaluations were superficial and evasive applications irrelevant to teacher development. Similarly, according to Nevo's findings (1994), teachers believed evaluation means which listed standards restricted contributions of evaluation to teaching development because they perceived that such means were used to control and motivate teachers, call teachers to account for tasks, and get rid of them in case of low performance.

Supervisors maintain that they look for and find the faults of teachers, revealing these faults as they are. They also report that they can offer only temporary solutions for the problems rather than permanent and long-lasting solutions. Based on these findings, it is concluded that supervisors are able to identify the problems of teachers, but inefficient in suggesting viable solutions.

Interrogator Role

Teachers describe their perceptions of supervisors with their interrogator role by using the metaphors of *"meat grinder", "mill", "stomachache", "clamp", "scarecrow",* and *"terminator"*. Those metaphors are used to describe the punitive, worrisome and stressful aspects of supervisors. Some of these descriptions are as following:

- *I think supervisors are like a meat grinder. They change the shape of an existing whole or break it into pieces. They are there to give punishments or apply sanctions.*

- *I resemble supervisors to a mill as they grind, fret and wipe out teachers.*

- *Supervisors are like a stomachache in the sense that they cause worry.*

- *I see supervisors like a scarecrow as they create an artificial fear. Scarecrows try to shoo the birds, but they are not real; they symbolically frighten the birds. In an interrogation process, supervisors function just like a scarecrow.*

Teachers describe supervisors as those who punish teachers, create worry and cause stress, trying to change and transform teachers, in addition to making teachers feel pressure, pain and fear during interrogations. Supervisors are also thought to make the interrogation process a never-ending loop.

This finding is parallel to criticisms by supervisors and teachers for the supervision system shown by a study which examined teachers' responses to supervision. Both teachers and supervisors criticize the supervision process for inauthentic teacher-supervisor relations and the pressure imposed on teachers (England, 1993).

In countries like England where there is strict supervision, teachers adversely consider the supervision process. In England, where teachers are deemed as technicians rather than professionals during the supervision process, teachers view the process as a traumatic experience and they become anxious and doubtful after supervision (Jeffrey and Woods, 1996). In the light of the research findings, it might be argued that supervision, particularly interrogation in Turkey, causes a traumatic experience in teachers.

Teachers may attempt to create an unnatural, positive impression during the supervision process rather than benefiting from that process as they feel under pressure (Ball, 1997). In Turkey, teachers could try to create a positive impression by preparing an impressive portfolio as they feel under pressure.

Considering their interrogator role, supervisors describe their metaphorical perceptions about supervisors with the metaphors of *"Gestapo officer", "seesaw",* and *"executioner"*. The metaphors of "*executioner*" and "*Gestapo officer*" are used to refer to their frightening, executing, and even destroying image, and the metaphor of "*seesaw"* is used to describe their difficulty in ensuring fairness in the decision making process. Some example statements of supervisors about their metaphorical perceptions in this dimension are as following:

- *I resemble them to a Gestapo officer. They are looking for faults with the purpose of executing people.*
- *Teaching is extremely affected in a negative sense during the interrogation period. Everyone at school keeps saying 'here are the hangmen to execute someone'.*
- *I think supervisors are like seesaw in the sense that one side has to outweigh as it is impossible to keep the exact balance.*

Supervisors view their condition as balance provider, creating fear and executing teachers. They believe that

they judge and execute teachers; thus, they protect the system by getting rid of the faulty parts. Thus, it can be concluded that in the role of interrogator, supervisors display a system-focused approach, not a human-focused approach, preferring to sacrifice the faulty components rather than to resolve the problems.

It is noted that perceptions of teachers and supervisors about the interrogator role of supervisors match partially, but there are also differences at certain points. To illustrate, both teachers and supervisors describe supervisors as executioners. However, although teachers believe this to be a negative feature of supervisors, supervisors claim that they adopt this attitude to protect the system from negative effects. Daresh (2001, p.36) states teachers always have a negative image about supervisors. The interrogator role of Turkish supervisors which does not exist in the role definitions of supervisors in other countries worsens their images.

CONCLUSION

Teachers and the supervisors included in the study produced totally 40 metaphors. All the 22 metaphors produced by the teachers were negative. On the other hand, 8 of the 18 metaphors produced by the supervisors were positive and 10 were negative. It is clear from these findings that both the teachers and the supervisors mostly had negative metaphorical perceptions about supervisor roles. However, in a study on prospective teachers' metaphorical perceptions about supervisors by Döş (2010), it was observed that teachers' metaphorical perceptions about supervisors were largely positive. The contradiction between the two studies could be explained by the difference between seniority and supervision experiences of the participants. The teacher group in Döş's study showed candidate teachers' perceptions about supervisors or in fact their expectations because such perceptions of candidate teachers who are not exposed to any supervision yet largely reflect perceptions about ideal supervisors. However, the teachers and the supervisors included in the study were in the experience range of at least five years. The results of the two studies show that there is a big difference between expectations of candidate teachers from supervisors and their impressions after becoming a part of the system and experiencing the current supervision practices. As it is clear, the current supervision practices in the Turkish education system do not meet the need for teacher development, which is the focus of contemporary supervision. In other words, supervision insight and practices in the Turkish education system do not go beyond case definition in the traditional supervision approach. As Sullivan and Glanz (2000, p.25) suggest,

inspectional supervision with an understanding of classical bureaucracy should be replaced in the 21st century schools, and supervisors need to become participative defenders of democratic values. In contemporary approach, it is necessary for supervisors to value on initiative, flexibility, and tolerance for ambiguity, collaboration and ethical mind-set.

Although there are research findings of positive supervisor impressions (e.g. Brimblecombe, Ormston and Shaw, 1995), supervisors are generally characterized by negative considerations such as being oppressive, stressful, punitive and frightening fault hunters. As Stevan and Blumberg (1986) argue, there is an explicit disagreement between teachers and supervisors regarding contributions of supervisors to teachers during the supervision process. Supervisors believe that their efforts are beneficial for teachers, while teachers complain that supervision is a complete failure. The two studies have come up with findings similar to those in the literature. It is clear that teachers long for non-oppressive teacher-supervisor relations based on needs rather than being a dreadful experience in which they feel free, and professionally supported in order to establish positive teacher-supervisor relations during the supervision process.

As Wilcox and Gray (1994) suggest, teachers' responses to the supervision process, results and supervisors depend on what and how supervisors evaluate for how long. As a result, it should not be disregarded that teachers' perceptions about supervision and supervisors concern the process and the process needs to be revised to get the expected results. Supervisors need to start positive relations with teachers, focus on positive aspects of teachers and evaluate teachers' faults as improvable areas during the supervision process. By doing this, supervisors might collaborate with teachers for professional development.

It is understood from the findings, in general, teachers and supervisors perceive all four roles attributed to supervisors by the Turkish Education System to be closely matching to what is expected from them ideally; however in practice, they fulfill these roles in a more different manner than what is actually expected, which leads to the fact that there are significant deficiencies of supervisors in all four roles. The reasons for supervisors not complying with the attributed roles, or better to say, not being able to comply with these roles, could be listed as following:

• Supervisors are not trained in accordance with the contemporary supervision approach.

• There is conflict between the interrogator and counselor-guide roles of supervisor.

Researchers in this study believe the incompetency in the training of supervisors to be the most important

reason. As the current profile of supervisors reveal, in the Turkish Education system, supervisors are assigned to the post without having obtained the required supervision formation. Therefore, the system forces them to learn the professional requirements while executing their job through expert-apprentice relationship, watching samples and/or trial and error. It would be a delusion to expect supervisors with such a profile to execute their profession in accordance with the requirements of contemporary supervision. If supervisors are to be expected to fulfill their expected roles thoroughly, they should be equipped with the supervision formation, for which at least a master's degree in educational administration and supervision should be a must.

Education supervisors need to be aware of teachers' perceptions if they would like to eliminate their negative image. Then, necessary precautions must be taken to transform negative perceptions to positive ones. To this end, the role of interrogator played by education supervisors must disappear since it causes fears in teachers. Also, education supervisors need to be provided with training in "supervision formation", which is currently not applied in the Turkish education system.

REFERENCES

Aydın M (1986). Çağdaş eğitim denetimi (Contemporary educational supervision). Im Publications, Ankara, Turkey.

Balcı A (1992). Eğitim Örgütlerine Yeni Bakış Açıları: Kuram-araştırma ilişkisi (New Perspectives to Educational Organizations: Theory-Research Relationship). Ankara University, Faculty of Educ. Sci. J. 25 (1): 47-68.

Balcı A (1999). Metaphorical Images of School: School Perceptions of Students, Teachers Parents from Selected Schools (In Ankara). Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, The Middle East Technical University. Ankara, Turkey.

Balcı A (2010). Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntem, Teknik ve İlkeler (Research Methods, Techniques, and Principles in Social Sciences). Pegem A Publications, Ankara, Turkey.

Ball SJ (1997). Good School / Bad School: paradox and fabrication. Br. J. Sociol. of Educ. 18 (3): 317-336.

Bennet T (1997). Clinical supervision marriage: A Matrimonial metaphor for understanding the supervisor-teacher relationship, ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED408246.

Blumberg A, Jonas RS (1987). Permitting access: The teachers control over supervision. Educ. Leadership. 44 (8): 58–62.

Blumberg A (1974). Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. McCutchan, Berkeley, CA.

Brimblecombe N, Ormston M, Shaw M (1995). Teachers' perceptions of school inspection: a stressful experience. Cambridge J. Educ. 25: 53-61.

Clarken RH (1997). Five Metaphors for Educators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of The American Educational Research Association. Chicago. March 24-28, 1997. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED407408.

Daresh JC (2001). Supervision As Proactive Leadership. Waveland Pres. Inc., USA.

Döş İ (2010). Metaphoric Perceptions of candidate teachers to the concept of inspectors. Gaziantep University Journal of Social

 Sciences. 9 (3): 607-629.

England GC (1993). Impact of the inspectorial system: a profession demeaned? J. Educ. Admin. 11 (1): 43-59.

Florence GW (2005). Teacher Supervision Methods in Virginia. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis in Virginia Commonwealth University. USA.

Glickman CD (1990). Supervision of instruction (Second Edition). Allyn and Bacon Publication. Boston.

Jeffrey B, Woods P (1996). Feeling deprofessionalized: The social construction of emotions during an OFSTED inspection. Cambridge J. Educ. 26 (3): 325-341.

Kitzinger J (1995). Qualitative research: Introducing focus group. Br. Med. J. 311: 299-302.

Lakoff G, Johnson M (1980). Metaphors we live by. Available at http://www.pineforge.com/upmdata/6031_Chapter_10_O'Brien_I_Pro of_8. (accessed 10 October, 2008).

Merriam SB (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. Jossey – Bass Pfeiffer. San Francisco.

Morgan G (1997). Images of organization. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks.

Nolan J, Hoover LA (2005). Teacher supervision and evaluation. John Wiley and Sons Inc. USA.

Nevo D (1994). How can teachers benefit from teacher evaluation. J. Personnel Evaluation in Educ. 8: 109-117.

Obilade SO (1992). Supervisory Behavior as perceived by secondary school teachers in Nigeria. School Organization. 12 (2): 237-243.

Ortony A (1977). Metaphor: Theoretical and emprical research. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED137752.

Perryman J (2006). Panoptic performativity and school inspection regimes: Disciplinary mechanisms and life under special measures. J. Educ. Policy. 21 (2): 147-161.

Perryman J (2007). Inspection and emotion. Cambridge J. Educ. 37 (2): 173-190.

Pizzi JD (2009). Urban secondary teachers' perceptions of a standards based teacher evaluation system. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Boston College. Lynch Graduate School of Educ. USA.

Sergiovanni TJ, Starratt RJ (2007). Supervision: A Redefinition, McGraw-Hill. New York.

Stevan, JR, Blumberg, A (1986). The Concept of Access in Supervisor-Teacher Relationships. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED272979.

Sullivan, S, Glanz, J (2000). Supervision that improves teaching. Corwin Press. California.

Taymaz, H (2005). Eğitim sisteminde teftiş (Supervision in educational system). Pegem A Publications. Ankara. Turkey.

Wilcox B, Gray J (1994). Reactions to inspection: a study of three variants. Cambridge J. Educ. 24: 245-259.

Woods P, Jeffrey B (1998). Choosing Positions: living the contradictions of OFSTED. Br. J. Sociol. of Educ. 19 (4): 547–570.

Yildirim A, Simsek H (2005). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel arastirma yöntemleri (Qualitative research methods in social sciences). Seckin Publications.