How Do Teachers Describe their Experiences with School-Based Supervision Applications with Metaphorical Expressions?[1]

Engin İş
Mardin Artuklu University, Turkey
 https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4304-0662

M. Semmih Summak
Gaziantep University, Turkey
 https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4900-6545

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' experiences about school-based supervision practices through metaphorical expressions. In the study, a descriptive case study approach, one of the qualitative research methods, was used. In sample selection, the maximum diversity sampling technique, a purposive sampling method, used and 38 teachers working in primary school (N=19) and secondary school (N=19) were participated in the study. "Scenario drafts" representing 4 supervision styles based on "School-Based Supervision Approaches Scale" developed by İş and Summak (2021) were used as a data collection tool in the study. The main purpose of the scenarios is to express the atmosphere of the supervision that takes place in the classroom through the eyes of an "outsider storyteller". The data was obtained through the scenario forms including expressions "The supervisory approach of the principal in the scenario is like…. Because: …". Descriptive analysis and content analysis techniques were used in the analysis of the data. The findings showed that the metaphors used by the participants regarding the supervisory approaches of the school principals were grouped under different categories in terms of their common characteristics. The results revealed that teachers' perceptions of supervisory approaches used by principals were generally negative. Based on the data patterns obtained from the "School-Based Supervision Approaches Scale", the participants used 130 metaphors using the "scenario drafts" representing the four supervision styles. It was found that 77% of the metaphors had negative and 23% positive meanings. The perception that school principals did not have the competency to make professional and objective evaluations in the supervision process and that they were inadequate in terms of communication and content knowledge were highlighted by the participants. As a result, it was concluded that when school principals have competencies to make a professional and objective evaluation, teachers will be eager to be supervised and have a positive perception to the school principals having a supervisor role.

Keywords: School Principal, School-based supervision, Scenario, Metaphor.

Introduction

Metaphors are essential tools to explain people's experiences, and phenomena. Metaphors refer to mental perception and consideration tools used to express our perceptions regarding phenomenon and concepts (Arnett, 1999). Metaphors are not only descriptions that reveal different aspects of an object by comparing it with other objects, but they also offer researchers the opportunity to theorize actions with different explanations and relationships (Berg & Lune, 2019, p. 274). Through metaphors, it is possible to understand school

---

1. This study was adopted from first author's doctoral thesis titled "An examination of school principals' school-based instructional supervision approaches based on teacher experiences: a mixed method research".

principals' supervision approaches, their supervisory roles and behaviors in the supervision process, and their communication attitudes towards teachers more profoundly.

Today, education is monitored in order to make schools more efficient learning and teaching environments and to achieve their desired/expected impact and goals (Sergiovanni & Starrat, 2006). As a common belief, the quality of success in education is directly related to the professional competence of teachers. In this context, the qualifications and equipment of teachers are considered key to improve students' educational activities (Celep, 2009; Levin, 2003). Succeeding in educational activities, both school principals and teachers play a significant role. The quality of the activities performed by administrators and teachers, who take an active role in the achievement of the objectives of the national education programs, becomes more important. The behavior of school principals during lesson and classroom inspection is one of the important factors influencing the professional development of teachers. In this regard, how the inspection method and content knowledge competencies of school principals, who are responsible for the inspection of teachers' teaching activities in Turkey, is perceived by teachers have an important role in improving educational activities.

As an alternative to bureaucratic and hierarchical control-based inspection approaches, school-based education has emerged as a model for improving school, teaching, and teacher evaluation. It emphasizes the importance of professional cooperation by conveying democratic methods in inspection (Sullivan & Glanz, 2015). Thrupp (1998) defines school-based supervision as "friendly inspection" and a democratic evaluation. Bulbul, Ozdem, and Inandı (2013, p.2109) explained school-based supervision as "a 'self-regulatory' mechanism where schools can identify their weak and superior aspects and where shareholders are responsible for their actions". Hofman, Dijkstra, and Hofman (2009) broadly defined school-based supervision as a systematic process for planning, goal setting, evaluation, and setting new development standards. Davies and Rudd (2001) explained school-based supervision as a "mirror" through which school

and teachers can understand where they are. This approach contributes significantly to expanding participatory democracy in school inspection (Sullivan & Glanz, 2015, p. 37). It can be said that school-based supervision is one of the most important models in the development of the progressive educational supervision reforms since the beginning of the 20th century, in that it offers development of democratic, colleague-interactive, and educational inspection in schools. In this sense, the school-based supervision model needs to become widespread in order to develop an understanding of inspection that supports participatory and democratic values in 21st century schools.

In Turkey, school-based supervision have not been implemented yet (Bulbul et al.2013, p. 2106). However,in Turkey, the recent changes and regulations such as removing the authority of education inspectors to inspect teachers, expanding the in spectoral jurisdiction of principals, and evaluation of teachers by school principals can be understood within the context of school-based inspection. In this study, school-based supervision is used in relation to the fulfillment of teacher-course/ classroom inspection and evaluation by school principals in schools.

In this period, especially classroom supervision practices of teachers became an important part of efficient and effective learning and teaching (Sullivan & Glanz, 2015). The principal is responsible for the establishment of an effective and qualified school. In addition to being the administrator, the school principal must also be the instructional leader of the school (Oyman & Turan, 2014). Many studies in the 1980s reported monitoring teachers and ensuring their continuous improvement as two basic dimensions of the school principal's instructional leadership role (Gumuseli, 2014). The professional guidance school principals offer to teachers is very important (Dufor & Berkey, 1995). Terry (1999) states that principals are required to support teachers professionally for instructional success. In effective schools, principals try hard to increase the performance of teachers by focusing on their professional development by guiding and supporting them. The main reason why principals focus on the professional development of teachers is to increase

teacher competence, thus increasing the success of students (Melenyzer, 1990). Today, it becomes more of an issue to support teachers professionally and to train and develop them to achieve the expected goals in schools. In schools, principals are the leaders who encourage and support teachers for their professional development.

Studies in the literature have mainly investigated perceptions about basic concepts such as school principal in the field of education, teacher, student, school through metaphors (Sonmez & Ozer Aytekin, 2020). In addition studies on supervision have focused on teachers' perceptions of the inspection process and their expectations from the inspection through metaphors (Ozan & Sener, 2015). Among the studies, a number of studies examined the participants' perceptions of the school principal (Akan & Yarım, 2019; Akan, Yalcın, & Yıldırım, 2014; Akbaslı, Uredi & Kosece, 2018; Aslan, Bilgili & Kaya, 2018; Cerit, 2010; Cobanoglu & Gokalp, 2015; Erturk & Akgun, 2020; Inbar, 1996; Johnson, 2006; Hernández-Amorós & Martínez Ruiz, 2018; Heffernan, 2019, Korkmaz & Cevik, 218; Linn, Sherman & Gill, 2007; Pesen, Kara & Gedik, 2015; Schechter, Shaked, Ganon-Shilon & Goldratt , 2018; Tvnavcevic & Vaupot, 2009; Yalcın & Enginer, 2012; Zembat, Tunceli & Aksin 2015) and the inspection processes made by the inspectors using metaphors (Balcı et al., 2011; Demirtas & Kahveci, 2015; Lee & Gren, 2009; Memduhoglu & Mazlum, 2014; Nolan & Hoover, 2005; 2009; Toremen & Dos, 2009; Vaiz, Bahcelerli & Vaiz, 2019; Yıldırım, 2012). Metaphor studies investigating school principals have been conducted on pre-service teachers, students, teachers, and school principals. In these studies, the human characteristics and professional competencies of school principals have been emphasized more frequently (Kaya, 2020). It was found that school principals perceived those human relations professionally (Kaya & Koca, 2020; Şahin & Sabancı, 2018; Yıldız et al., 2018).

However, to the best of the researchers, there is no study examining school principals' school-based supervision approaches and perceptions based on teacher experiences through metaphors. It is important to reveal the perceptions of teachers about the supervision approaches of school principals, who

have an important place in the education system. It is thought that examining teachers' perceptions of school principals' approaches to supervision and their perspectives on inspection through metaphors will contribute to the literature in this sense. This study is of great importance in terms of providing data for the authorities and practitioners for the approaches of school principals in the supervision process. At the same time, school-based supervision approaches will make an important contribution to researchers and literature in terms of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the system. In this study, metaphors representing teacher experiences of school-based supervision approaches are also significant in that they provide an insight into the perceptions of teachers towards school principals' inspection approaches.

Purpose and Importance of the Research

The aim of this study was to reveal the experiences of teachers about school-based supervision practices with metaphorical expressions. In this context, revealing the effects of school principals' teacher evaluation practices on the basis of teacher experiences was essential in order to examine the effects on student achievement, teaching practices and the quality of school education. It is believed that the results of this study will contribute to the re-evaluation and structural criticism of the existing instructional inspection system by revealing the effects of inspection practices. In accordance with the purpose of the study, the questions were tried to be answered:

- What are the metaphors that teachers use about school-based supervision practices?
- How do teachers' metaphorical perceptions of school-based supervision define principals' supervisory method and content knowledge competencies?

Method
Research Method

In this study, descriptive case study approach, one of the qualitative research methods, was used to examine the opinions of teachers on school-based supervision approaches. The descriptive case study approach is a qualitative research method in which

the researcher tries to describe and analyze one or more situations in detail (Berg & Lune, 2019, p. 354). In the study, pragmatist philosophy was taken as an interpretative framework. Rather than antecedent conditions, pragmatist philosophy focuses on the product of the study, such as actions, situations, and results of the research (Creswell, 2016). Thus, by focusing on the research question and the results of the research, it emphasizes that the research question and purpose are more important than both world views and approaches and methods (Feilzer, 2010; Morgan, 2007).

Study Group

The study group in this study consisted of 38 teachers (19) working in primary schools (19) and secondary schools (19) in Artuklu, Mardin in the 2018-2019 academic year. Maximum variation sampling, one of the purposive sampling methods, was used in the study. The maximum variation sampling method is used to describe the common or different aspects of individuals in different situations related to the investigated problem in a broader framework without generalization (Cokluk, Sekercioglu, & Buyukozturk 2018; Creswell, 2017, p. 81). The main purpose of purposive sample selection is to include rich situations to carry out the study in detail (Patton, 2014, p. 230). In this study, the fullness of the information was considered in the selection of the sample (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2015).

Data Collection Tool

A scenario-based data tool was used to collect data in the study. Scenarios are stories which contain dialogue and descriptions in the main story line. The main purpose of the scenarios is to show how the sequence of events in a control approach takes place in the classroom from the perspective of an "outside story-teller" (Field, 2016). The data in the study were collected using "scenario sketches" representing 4 audit styles based on the data patterns obtained from the "School-Based Control Approaches Scale" developed by Is and Summak (2021). The scenarios were used as data collection tools to provide a deep understanding of the experiences of the participants. The data were obtained through the questions such

as "The supervisor's approach to auditing in the scenario is like …. because: …" written at the end of the scenario sketches. Scenario-based data collection is successful when big data collection methods can summarize the data obtained and provide valuable in sights. Therefore, well-defined scenario-based data collection can be a useful and effective way to capture the essence of the investigated event (Najran & Dahanayake, 2015). In order to ensure confidentiality, the names of the participants were coded as I1, I2, I3 …S19 and O1, O2, … O19. Scenario sketches and scale dimensions of school-based supervision approaches are presented in Table.1.

Table 1 Scenario Sketches and School-Based Control Approaches Scale Dimensions

Scenario	School-based supervision Approaches Scale Sub-Dimensions
Scenario-1	Authority Oriented Inspection
Scenario-2	Development Oriented Inspection
Scenario-3	Practical Inspection
Scenario-4	Social Network Based Inspection

Data Collection and Analysis

In the study, data were obtained using scenario form drafts. The basic principle in qualitative methods is to give participants the opportunity to explain their world views and thoughts in their own words without any limitations (Patton, 2014). Qualitative research focuses on validity rather than reliability, and four criteria are recommended to determine whether the researcher and participants are correct, reliable, and credible. These are believability, transferability, reliability and verifiability. In addition, consistency control, confirm ability control, participant confirmation, expert evaluation, adverse situation analysis and detailed description constitute the most important criteria for validity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 300-331). Bryman (2004) used the concept of transparency as a quality indicator in qualitative studies. Transparency refers to the researcher at each stage of the study, the selection of the participants, who they are, how the data is analyzed, how the conclusions are reached, etc. expressed as clarity of explanation.

In the study, the following criteria were taken into account in the validity and reliability study of qualitative data. In the scenarios, credibility was tried to be ensured by selecting the participants on a voluntary basis and providing participant confirmation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). After the analysis of the data, the participants were confirmed that the information was correct and negative or opposite ideas were stated on the themes (Berg & Lune, 2019, p.112). Trying to explain the method and stages of the research process in a clear and understandable way by the researcher, associating the data with the results, taking into account different opinions in the research and hiding the raw data are considered as the factors that ensure the external reliability of the research. In order to ensure the external reliability of the study, expert opinion was obtained from two academicians to purify the data from the researcher's judgments (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2015, p. 349). In order to increase the internal consistency of the study, the research questions prepared with the scenario contents were checked by the field experts in terms of language and intelligibility. The data were compatible with the research results, and the data that were not valid in the data analysis process were not evaluated as data in order to provide and increase internal reliability.

In data analysis, descriptive analysis and content analysis techniques were used (Berg & Lune, 2019). Descriptive analysis is a form of analysis in which data is defined, explained and described. Content analysis, on the other hand, is a systematic technique in which some words of a text are summarized and classified into smaller content categories with coding based on certain rules, and the classifications obtained can be converted into numerical data (Creswell, 2016). The metaphors obtained from the scenario drafts were analyzed using the content analysis method. While conducting content analysis, each metaphor was analyzed and evaluated in terms of its use in different meanings or common features. If the metaphors were not explained and the similes did not match, they were excluded.

The frequency values given in the tables indicate the number of those who answered that question, and similar statements were given once to avoid repetition of statements. The themes obtained on the basis of the scenario are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Themes Based on the Scenario

Scenario	School-based supervision Approaches Scale Sub-Dimensions	Themes
Scenario-1	Authority Oriented Inspection	Four Themes
Scenario-2	Development Oriented Inspection	Three Themes
Scenario-3	Practical Inspection	Four Themes
Scenario-4	Social Network Based Inspection	Five themes

Findings

The findings obtained in the study were interpreted using the tables and explanations. Depending on the frequencies of the codes, teachers' opinions are shown in tables and figures.

Table 3 Frequencies of Metaphors Used by the Participants in Scenario-1 on Principals'" Authority-Oriented Supervision Approach"

Metaphor	Explanations	(f)	(%)
Nimrod	He wants everyone to adore him	1	3.12
Guard	Cause of fear and fuss, Solid and useless	2	6.30
Dictator	He wants to mold the teacher into the mold he wants, is a nightmare for the teacher, has sole say in control, All for the school principal, He sees himself as the owner and above everything.	5	15.64
Traffic police	Punishment Writer	1	3.12
Notary	confirms	1	3.12
Boss	Smarty-Pants, sees himself as the owner of the school	2	6.30
Time Bomb	bomb that doesn't know when it will explode	1	3.12

Smug	stuck in their own truth	1	3.12
cat jumping out of litter	Unexpected control provokes unexpected reactions	1	3.12
foreman	Master working in factory	1	3.12
Extrajudicial Executioner	Supervises to blame the teacher	1	3.12
Judge	Doesn't care about the teacher, only focuses on the conclusion part and evaluates it.	1	3.12
watchman	Manager communication one-way	1	3.12
Unwanted Guest	The guest who came uninvited and judged the household	1	3.12
The destructive critic	His teacher made him feel inadequate.	1	3.12
scarecrow	He thinks that his presence can only get things done.	1	3.12
woman with tongs	His approach to the teacher is overbearing and strict	1	3.12
monument of arrogance	Those who do not respect the people they work with	1	3.12
Bulldozer	Grinder	1	3.12
vulgarian	The person who forgets where he came from, who is overturned by the office	1	3.12
The irritating principal	His demeanor is so disgusting	1	3.12
knock-out guest	unexpected unwanted person	1	3.12
Prosecutor	He treats teachers like they are criminal	1	3.12
Police	Prioritizing rules and regulations	1	3.12
incompetent	Incompetent manager	1	3.12
authoritarian	Manager has the full and only authority	1	3.12
Total		32	100

Table 3 showed that the teachers used a total of 32 metaphors regarding the principals' supervision approach in "Authority-oriented supervision" scenario. Al of the metaphors had negative meanings. 23 of them were used by one participants. The metaphors used most by the participants were: the dictator (5), the guard (2) and the boss (2). Among the used metaphors, the "dictator" had the highest frequency, with a frequency of 14.70%. Participants perceived the principals' supervision approaches as oppressive, self-centered, uncooperative, sole power, status quo and authoritarian. Such a supervision approach evokes negative spiritual feelings such as fear, insecurity, stress and anxiety on teachers. In addition, themes were established based on the metaphors used by the teachers.

Table 4 The Distribution of the Metaphors Used by the Participants in Scenario-1 on Principals' "Authority-Oriented Supervision Approach"by Themes

Themes	Metaphors (Codes)	(f)	(%)
Destructive/Negative attitude	Dictator (5), Time boom(1), destructive critic (1), Woman with tongs (1), Bulldozer(1),	9	28.13
Self-Pleasing/Growing	Nimrod(1), Smug (1), Monument of arrogance (1), incompetent (1)	4	12.50

Control/Punishment oriented	Guard (2), Traffic police (1), Notary (1), Boss (2), Foreman (1), Extrajudicial executioner (1), Judge (1), Watchman (1), Prosecutor (1), Police(1), Authoritarian (1)	13	40.62
Disturbing	Cat jumping out of litter (1), Unwanted guest (1), scarecrow(1), vulgarian(1), İrritating principal (1), Knock-out guest (1)	6	18.75
Total		32	100

Table 4 revealed that the metaphors used by the participants regarding the "Authority-oriented supervision" sub-dimension were categorized under the themes of"Destructive/negative attitude (f=9), Self-admiration/arrogance (f=4), Control/ punishment orientation (f=13), Disturbing (f=6)". It was found that the "control/punishment oriented

(40.62%)" theme was the mostly used one, followed by the theme of "Destructiveness/negative attitude (28.13%). These themes indicated that the participants perceived the supervisors' understanding of control as a punishment-oriented, destructive, authoritarian and control-based .

Table 5 Frequencies of Metaphors Used by the Participants in Scenario-2 on the Principal's "Development-Oriented Supervision Approach"

Metaphor	Explanations	(f)	(%)
Pole Star	Becomes a guide in the dark, shows the way	1	3.33
Constructive principal	Contributes to education,	1	3.33
Hulusi Kentmen	sweet tough daddy	1	3.33
Psychologist	For watching patiently, silently, and then explaining the shortcomings they see without being hurtful.	1	3.33
Doctor	Diagnose and heal	1	3.33
Flashlight	For guiding and developing the teacher	1	3.33
Torch	Guiding and guiding the teacher	1	3.33
Gentleman	The person who knows what, when and how to do	1	3.33
Sun	Illuminates the teacher professionally	1	3.33
Amiable principal	His approach to the teacher is very mild	1	3.33
Guidance counselor	He helps the teacher, always wants to help	2	6.66
Democratic principal	Leader who prioritizes education	2	6.66
Father principal	Caring and owning the teacher	1	3.33
Opera conductor	Guides the teacher and teaching	1	3.33
Father-principal	Like a master who teaches his apprentice without beating	1	3.33
Constructive developer manager	Develops teacher and teaching	1	3.33
Pencil	Writes beautiful things	1	3.33
Mother	Approaches the teacher like a child	1	3.33
Utopian principal	Contributes to the teacher professionally	1	3.33
plane-tree	Reliable personality who will benefit from his knowledge and power and lean on	1	3.33
Observer	Observes the teacher smoothly and gives good feedback	1	3.33
Traffic sign	Guiding and directing the teacher to the right path	1	3.33
Rainbow	The rainbow after the rain, multi-colored and democratic	1	3.33
Lighthouse	Heguides the teacher like a lighthouse that guides ships.	1	3.33

Street light with sensor	Helights where needed, when needed,	1	3.33
Master-apprentice	Teacher training style is very positive	1	3.33
Coach	Directs the teacher professionally by giving tactics	1	3.33
Artisan	Thoughtful, patient and tolerant	1	3.33
Total		30	100

Table 5 showed that the participants used a total of 30 metaphors for the principal's supervision approach in the scenario regarding the "Development-oriented supervision". All of the metaphors used by the participants had positive meanings. 26 of them were produced by one person. The mostly used metaphors were as follows: the democratic principal(2) and the guidance teacher(2). In this scenario, the school principals' supervisory approach were perceived as democratic, guiding, informative, collaborative, professionally enlightening and developing. The findings indicated that teachers and principals emphasized more on professional guidance and development-oriented supervision. It can be argued that teachers had a positive perception towards the supervision approach based on the "Development-oriented supervision".

Table 6 The Distribution of the Metaphors Used by the Participants in Scenario-2 of the Principal's "Development-Oriented Supervision Approach" by Themes

Themes	Metaphors (Codes)	(f)	(%)
Guiding/Guidance	Pole Star (1), Flashlight (1), Torch (1), Sun (1), Guidance counselor (2), Opera conductor (1), Father-Master (1), Observer (1), Traffic sign (1), Lighthouse (1), Street light with sensor (1), Master-apprentice (1), Coach (1)	14	46.67
Effective communication	Hulusi Kentmen(1), Psychologist (1), Gentleman (1), amiable manager (1), Mother (1), Rainbow (1), Artisan (1)	7	23.33
Supporter/Developer	Constructive principal (1), Doctor (1), Democratic principal (2), Father principal (1), Constructive developer principal (1), Pencil (1), Utopian principal (1), plane-tree (1)	9	30.00
Total		30	100

Table 6 showed that the metaphors were grouped under the themes of "Guidance/guidance (f=14), Supporter/developer (f=9), Effective communication (f=7)" regarding the "Development-oriented supervision" sub-dimension. Among the themes, the most used one was "Demonstration/guidance (46.67%)", followed by "Supporter/developer (30%) and Effective communication (23.33%)" themes. The participants used metaphors such as guidance and guiding person, pole star, guidance teacher, traffic sign, lighthouse, father principal and opera conductor for principals' supervision approach. All of the teachers expressed positive opinions about the supervision process in the principal supervision approach in the scenario. Accordingly, it can be said that teachers regarded supervision approach in this scenario positively with an understanding that guides them professionally and develops them by supporting them.

Table 7 Frequencies of Metaphors Used by the Participants in Scenario-3 on Principal's "Operational Control Approach"

Metaphor	Explanations	(f)	(%)
Horror movie	irritating and unsettling	1	3.03
Disruptive principal	The feedback to the teacher is in the dimension of destructive criticism.	1	3.03
Dirty window	Before criticizing and judging people is to look at our state of mind and realize if we are ready to see the 'good'	1	3.03

Authoritarian	He only cares about the law; the principal ignores the conditions and sees the truth as the only truth; cares nothing but discipline and law	3	9.10
Sudden braking noise	Hehas no function other than to scare the teacher.	1	3.03
Controller	Checks regulatory compliance	1	3.03
incompetent	a waste for education	1	3.03
Mediocre	The understanding that harms the teacher more than contributes to the supervision	1	3.03
Let friends see you shopping	To pretend to do business and transactions on paper, to perform for show	1	3.03
Police	Very prescriptive	1	2.78
Bureaucratic principal	Selfish, harsh, rude, questioning the teacher, consolidating his position; prescriptive, black wall, cold; I will rule everything will be as I want; It's for legislation only.	5	15.15
Braked truck	It is not clear what the principal will do, the understanding looking for an excuse to burn the teacher	1	3.03
Lawyer	Trying to make everything fit the legal book	1	3.03
Wall	contact closed	1	3.03
Mandatory-Judicial principal	Always judge the teacher	1	3.03
Archivist	Wants everything completely in accordance with official rules	1	3.03
İntrusive	Disrespectful by dividing the teacher without caring	1	3.03
Judge	Harsh, critical and judgmental	1	3.03
Criticizing principal	Causes a feeling of inferiority in the teacher with his constant criticism	1	3.03
Volcano	Like a volcano that is likely to explode but uncertain when it will explode, the impact area may be greater than expected.	1	3.03
Mold maker	Trying to dress the teacher in one dress	1	3.03
Evil spirit	Evil spirit escaping from Pandora's box	1	3.03
Despotic	Controls to oppress the teacher	1	3.03
Pyrus victory	What we lost while we won	1	3.03
Boss	Similar to the boss-employee relationship	1	3.03
Prosecutor	Prioritizes the law and laws, treats the teacher like a criminal	1	3.03
Executive officer	As if the one who does not care about the feelings will only deal with the physical conditions and bring the file that needs to be filled to the creditor.	1	3.03
Total		33	100

Table 7 indicated that a total of 33 metaphors were used for the supervision approach in the scenario regarding the "Operational supervision" sub-dimension. All metaphors used by the participants had negative meanings. 25 of the metaphors were produced by one person. The metaphors mostly used by the participants were bureaucratic director (5) and authoritarian (3). The participants interpreted the supervisory approach of school principals as anti-democratic, oppressive, despotic, fair and non-objective bureaucracy. Accordingly, it can be stated that teachers perceived this supervision approach as a bureaucratic control approach that creates fear, insecurity, stress and anxiety. Themes were established based on the metaphors used by the participants. Themes and the metaphors are shown in Table 8.

Table 8 The Distribution of the Metaphors Used by the Participants in the Scenario-3 of the Principal's "Operational Control Approach" by Themes

Themes	Metaphors (Codes)	(f)	(%)
Destructiveness/negative attitude	Horror movie (1), Disruptive principal (1), Sudden braking noise(1), Braked truck(1), Mandatory-Judicial principal (1), Criticizing principal (1), Volcano (1), Evil spirit (1), Despotic (1)	9	27.27
Formalist/ Legislation Indexed	Authoritarian (3), Controller(1), Police(1), Bureaucratic principal(5), Lawyer (1), Archivist(1), Judge (1), Mold maker (1), Boss (1), Prosecutor(1), Executive officer (1)	17	51.51
Ineffective/not adding value	incompetent (1), Mediocre(1), Let friends see you shopping (1), Pyrus victory (1)	4	12.12
Negative Communication	Dirty window(1), Wall (1), İntrusive (1)	3	10.10
Total		33	100

Table 8 showed that there were four themes in operational control approach as "Destructive/ negative attitude (f=9), Formative/legislation indexed (f=17), Ineffective/non-value-creating (f=4), Negative communication (f=3)". It was found that the mostly used theme was "formalist/ legislation indexed (51.51%)", followed by the themes of "Destructive/negative attitude (27.27%), Ineffective/not creating value (12.12%) and Negative communication (10.10%)". The participants considered the principal as a destructive authority figure, just like in scenario-1 in their metaphors. All of the teachers had a negative perception about the supervision process in the scenario. The teachers described the principal figure in this scenario as "bureaucratic principal (f=5), authoritarian (f=3), unworthy (f=1), despot (f=1), destructive principal (f=1), commanding-judgmental principal. (f=1")". The negative emotions such as insecurity, fear, stress and anxiety in Scenario-1 were also used in Scenario-3. The holistic examination of metaphors revealed that the participants interpreted the supervision approach in this scenario as a bureaucratic and authority-weighted supervision process, and they found the supervisor's understanding and skills of supervision inadequate and ineffective in terms of professional development.

Table 9 Frequencies of Metaphors Used by the Participants in Scenario-4 Regarding the Principal's "Social Network Based Supervision Approach"

Metaphor	Explanations	(f)	(%)
It's like ordering steak to a vegetarian.	It is thought to be good, but it never meets the need, it is not useful.	1	2.85
So-called principal	The principal's purpose is not to evaluate the teacher.	1	2.85
Karagöz and Hacivat	Prearranged business	1	2.85
Friend	ignores errors;	2	5.71
Word acrobat	just makes things work; manages affairs; manages people	3	8.57
Mother-in-law	A mother-in-law who makes a difference between her daughters-in-law should not make a difference between teachers, she should do her job professionally and should be a professionally developing supervision.	1	2.85
Client principal	He treats according to person	3	8.57
Friendly	Makes the audit out of formality	1	2.85
It came like this, it will go like this	Educational does not care about anything, is callous	1	2.85
Rainbow	Goes in any color	1	2.85
unprofessional	Confusing work and friendship is the biggest mistake; away from seriousness that prioritizes daily relationships; torn between his private life and his work life	3	8.57

Fatherly	He only cares about the emotional side; He acts like a parent, not a manager.	2	5.71
Friend	treats his/her friend well, but treats others differently.	1	2.85
Mask	Treats teachers differently depending on their relationships	1	2.85
Oh never mind	An understanding that doesn't see the shortcomings that doesn't wear anything	1	2.85
Get word the bag is full	Obligatory work done for the sake of doing, having done for the sake of doing	1	2.85
Chameleon	Changes color immediately according to the teacher	1	2.85
Teddy bear	Manager ignores mistakes due to friendship	1	2.85
Candy	Sweet as candy, can't stand the teacher	1	2.85
Old friend	He is conditioned to what is not, but to what is not, and he comforts the teacher, even if he has shortcomings.	1	2.85
Buddy - sergeant	Abuse of power, favoritism	2	5.71
Dish wire	A very complex personality	1	2.85
Broken scales	An objective result cannot be obtained in evaluating the teacher.	1	2.85
Cowardly lion	The principal is the guide of education, if he does not do it because he has something to lose, he is a coward.	1	2.85
Neither skewer nor kebab	It does not touch the meaty milky, it does not mix	1	2.85
Animator	He uses the classroom scene and descends, performs his role and returns to his real life	1	2.85
Total		35	100

Table 9 showed that teachers used a total of 35 metaphors for the principal's supervision approach in the "social network-based supervision" scenario. All of the metaphors had negative meanings. 20 of the metaphors produced by one person. The most frequent metaphors were "nepotism principal (3), acrobat (3), unprofessional (3), crone-sergeant (2), fatherly (2) and friend" (2). Participants perceive principals' supervisory approachas a nepotistic approach that manages the affairs and people only by making things work, makes the supervision from a formality, mixes business and friendship and treats according to person. It can be said that teachers hada negative perception about the supervision approach in this scenario.

Table 10 The Distribution of the Metaphors Used by the Participants in the Teachers from the Scenario-4 of the Principal's "Social Network Based Supervision Approach" by Themes

Themes	Metaphors (Codes)	(f)	(%)
Favorite/ Hesitant	Client principal (3), Mother-in-law (1), Rainbow(1), Dude (1), Mask (1), Chameleon(1), Buddy - Sergeant (2), Animator (1)	11	31.44
Ineffective/ not creating value	So-called principal (1), It's like ordering steak to a vegetarian. (1), Karagöz and Hacivat (1), Unprofessional (3), Dish wire(1), Broken scales(1)	8	22.85
Formal/ doing things for formality	Word acrobat (3), Friendly (1), It came like this, it will go like this (1), Oh never mind (1), Get word the bag is full (1)	7	20.00
not taking risks	Cowardly lion (1), Neither skewer nor kebab (1)	2	5.71
relaxing/ soothing	Friend (2), Fatherly (2), Teddy bear (1), Candy(1), Old friend (1)	7	20.20
Toplam		35	100

Table 10 show that there were four themes in "supervision based on social networking": "Favorite/ Hesitant (f=11), Ineffective/not creating value (f=8), Formal/doing things for formality (f=7) , relaxing/

soothing (f=7), not taking risks (f=2)". It was found that "Favorite/ ambivalent (31.44%)" theme was the most used theme. In this theme, the participants used metaphors that emphasized the personality traits of the principals rather than their understanding of control. Accordingly, it can be said that teachers expected the principles to be objective, transparent and fair during the supervision process. This theme was followed by the themes of "Ineffective/doesn't create value (22.85%), Relaxing/peaceful (20.20%), Formal/doing business out of formality (20%) and Not taking risks (5.71%)". These findings revealed that the teachers regarded the supervision approach in this scenario as a bureaucratic understanding that discriminates favorably, is ineffective in terms of professional development and does not create value, is fulfilled over formality and does not take risks. On the other hand, in the theme of "relaxing/ peaceful" (20.20%), some participants regarded this understanding of control as psychologically relaxing for them. Although the comforting aspects of the supervision approach were emphasized in this theme, this emphasis was weak.

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to reveal teachers' experiences about school-based supervision practices with metaphorical expressions. For this reason, in this study, it was aimed to investigate how the supervision approaches applied by principals at school were perceived by teachers through metaphors.

The metaphors used by participants were collected under 16 themes in total. The themes in the "authority-oriented supervision" sub-dimension revealed that the participants used metaphors mainly in the "control/punishment-oriented (40.62%)" theme, followed by the theme of "Destructiveness/negative attitude (28.13%). In "operational supervision" sub-dimension, the themes of "Formalist/legislation indexed (51.51%)" and Disruptiveness/negative attitude (27.27%) were used mostly by participant, followed by "Ineffective/non-value adding (12.12%) and Negative communication (10.10%)" themes. It was found that the theme of "control/ punishment orientation (40.62%)" were used most in the "authority-oriented supervision" approach and

"formalist/legislation indexed (51.51%)" were used most in "Operational supervision". Accordingly, it can be concluded that teachers perceived supervision as more control/punishment-oriented and regulatory compliance supervision based on their experiences. The metaphors in the sub-dimension of supervision based on social networking, the theme of "Favorite/ ambivalent (31.44%)" was used mainly. In this theme, the participants used metaphors that put more emphasis on the personality traits of the principals rather than their supervisory approaches. Accordingly, it can be said that teachers expected the principles to be objective, transparent and fair during the supervision process. This theme was followed by the themes of "Ineffective/doesn't create value (22.85%), Relaxing/peaceful (20.20%) and Formal/doing things for formality (20%)". Some of the participants agreed on the "ineffective/doesn't create value" theme and stated that they considered the supervisory approach of principals as ineffective and not creating value in terms of professional development. The images related to the metaphors was mainly negative emotions such as insecurity, fear, stress and anxiety. When the metaphors are evaluated holistically, it can be said that the participants interpreted the supervision approach in these three scenarios as "bureaucratic, authoritative and ineffective/not creating value", and that they found the supervisor's understanding and skills of the principal insufficient and ineffective in terms of professional development. It was found in this study that the participants perceived the supervisors' supervision understanding as punishment-oriented, destructive for themselves, formative/legislation indexed, favoritist/ambivalent, authoritarian and control/punishment-oriented. In many studies, the images of "bureaucratic, authority, control and punishment" regarding the supervisor and the supervision process were emphasized (Koçak & Memişoğlu, 2020; Şahin, Bilecik & Saçlı, 2020). Britton et al. (2002) reported that participants attributed more meanings such as anxiety and control to inspection. Demirtaş and Kahveci(2015) found "authority" and "punisher" metaphors were used for the concept of supervisor. Kaya and Demir (2010), stated that authority (27.8%) category was the most used category expressed by the participants.

According to Boydak and Şener (2015) concluded that 56.6% of teachers had a negative perception about the supervision process in schools. Tüzel and Kalyon (2017) found that the theme of "autocracy" emerged as an important issuein the metaphors teachers used for school principals. It can be said that these negative opinions derive from the fact that the bureaucratic aspect of the supervision, based on control, is prioritized rather than professional development. According to Glickman, Gordon, and Gordon (2014), it is not surprising that most of the teachers do not relate supervision with professional development and cooperation, since the role of supervision in the historical process is monitor and control.

In the literature on educational supervision in Turkey, the majority of criticisms is that the supervision process is generally carried out with an understanding of control, deficient, and error-seeking. In the report by the School Administrators of Turkey (2019), it is stated that the supervision practices in Turkey are evaluated on paper and as the process of finding deficiencies. Course inspections in schools are considered as a status report, inspections are generally carried out in the form of examining documents and files, and are carried out as a formal inspection (Arslan & Aslan, 2015; Göksoy & Öztürk, 2018; Karabay, 2014; Korkmaz, 2015; Memişoğlu & Ekinci, 2013). Glanz, Shulman and Sullivan (2007) stated that the supervision practices of school principals are perfunctory in accordance with the legislation. Hsıeh and Shen (1998) stated that in the supervision process, bureaucratic affairs took precedence and education-related issues remained in the background. Highlighting the elements such as control, error and search for vulnerabilities in the supervision process may harm the professional development of teachers in instructional supervision. These findings show that the principals have not yet fully fulfilled the objectives of the supervision practices and that the teachers do not attach enough importance to the guidance aspect for professional development during the supervision process (Dobbelear, Prins, & Van Dongen 2012). It can be said that the results of these studies coincide with and support the results of the present study.

In this study, the participants used metaphors expressing that they experienced negative emotions such as insecurity, fear, stress, and anxiety during the supervision. Various studies have also shown that supervision creates tension, uneasiness, haste, excitement, demoralization, fear and stress on teachers and causes negative effects in schools (Britton et al., 2002; Perryman, 2007; Özan & Özdemir, 2010; Tekin & Yılmaz. , 2012; Tunç et al., 2013; Demir & Tok, 2016). In this respect, it can be said that the results of the research are in line with those in the literature.

The attitudes and behaviors of the principals in the supervision processes in schools have important effects on the personal professional development of teachers. Using the school principal's unfair and unreliable practices as a pressure factor on teachers will distract teachers from a peaceful and productive working environment. Misbehaviors and practices shown by principals during course inspections negatively affect teachers' professional and pedagogical development and motivation. When teachers do not feel control as a threat and a means of punishment, they will be more motivated to fulfill their duties and to develop new skills (Zepeda, 2016, p. 218).

In this study, some of the participants stated that with the metaphors that they found the supervision process ineffective/doesn't create value, and that they found the supervisor's understanding of supervision inadequate and ineffective in terms of professional development. The school principal has most important role in the professional guidance. The supervision by school principals is of great importance in terms of the effectiveness of teaching activities. Course supervision practices carried out by school principals are extremely important in terms of improving the professional performance of teachers and the success of education and training activities. However, in many studies, results have showed that there is a negative perception towards school principals. According to Sullivan and Glanz (2015, p. 39), "the understanding that supervision is seen as a control and punishment tool has created very deep and ingrained institutional beliefs among teachers. In the thoughts and beliefs of many teachers, these features are accepted as a part of the supervision process. These beliefs of teachers

about supervision significantly affect the supervision processes. These beliefs are so deeply ingrained and taken for granted that they affect the relationships of teachers and administrators regarding supervision processes. Teachers also stated that they considered supervision as an open-seeking behavior and that the pressure and fear they experience were the cause of negative perception.

We can also consider the perceptions regarding the school principal as prejudices formed as a result of the experiences described in the society. There are many studies showing that these judgments begin with negative experiences in student life at schools. Aslan, Bilgili, and Kaya (2018) found that 33.7% of the metaphors that students used regarding the school principal had a negative meaning. In the same study, the most striking theme was "being harsh and oppressive (20.1%), and the most produced metaphor was "Dictator". School principals were mostly described as the "discipline machine" and the "guardian". Tüzel and Şahin (2014) investigated the pictures drawn by the students (N=154) about school principal and found that they mostly depicted the school principal in front of the students (f=37, 61%). Accordingly, most of the students stated that they perceived the principal as alone and separate from the students, they did not feel close to them. Yalçın and Erginer (2014) investigated the drawings reflecting the thoughts of primary school students about the principal and found that "being a negative factor (27.30%)" emerged as the most frequent theme. Pesen, Kara, and Gedik (2015), examined 2nd Gradechild development students' metaphor perceptions regarding the concept of "principal", and found that the themes of "being an element of negativity (24%) and "being an ineffective factor (14.2%)" were expressed most. In addition, Örücü (2014), found that out of 60 metaphors used by pre-service pre-school teachers for school administrators, 44 had negative meanings, 12 had positive meanings and 4 had neutral meanings. Therefore, it can be said that the perceptions of child development students who will work in preschool education institutions and pre-service pre-school teachers overlap. Lum (1997) stated that the school principal is perceived by students as a symbol of authority, punishing and frightening. In the metaphorical analysis

study of Şahin and Sabancı (2018), students who receive pedagogical formation education regarding considered the concept of school principal as "autocrat, destructive authoritarian, open-seeker, source of fear, useless and bureaucrat" at a rate of 47%. These results indicates that a negative perception towards school principals emerges in the individuals' perceptions since their student life.

It can be said that this negative perception continues in the future life of individuals. Çobanoğlu and Gökalp (2015) obtained the themes of "negativeness, oppression and power" in prospective teachers' metaphorical perceptions of the school principal. The metaphor of "dictator" was used the mots by prospective eachers in this study. Yalçın and Erginer (2014) found that some of the teachers (21.39%) expressed the principals as "being a negativity factor, being a power factor, being harsh and oppressive". Kaya and Koca (2019) examined metaphor studies on the concept of school principal in a meta-synthesis research on the theme of human competence, and the category of "negative human characteristics" was found at a rate of 32%. In Örücü (2014) the theme of "autocrat" stood out in the metaphors used for school administrators. With metaphors such as the Gestapo and the commander, the participants portrayed the principals as authoritarian, oppressive, normative and the person who carries out the control mechanisms. Akan and Yarım (2019) revealed that the participants expressed the commander (47.7%) in the metaphors for the concept of principal. Kaya(2020) concluded that school principals were perceived negatively by social media writers in terms of their personal characteristics. The results are important in that they show that the negative perception towards school principals begins with the studentship period and that negative educational experiences in the past have an influence in the thoughts and beliefs of many teachers. These negative beliefs of teachers about school principals also affect the supervision processes. In this sense, the studies in the literature support the results of this study.

Although some of the participants in the studies in the literature had a negative perception towards the concept of "supervision and school principal", all of the 30 metaphors in the "Development-

oriented supervision" sub-dimension in our study were positive. In this sub-dimension,the themes of "Guidance/guidance (46.67%)", "Supporting/developing (30%) and Effective communication (23.33%)" came to the fore. All of the teachers expressed positive opinions about the supervision process of the principal in the scenario. These finding indicated that teachers emphasized the professional guidance and development-oriented supervision approach. Accordingly, it is important in terms of showing that teachers can approach the concept of school principal and supervision positively when they approach them with an understanding that guides them professionally, supports and develops them. On the basis of the negative views on the school principal's supervision approaches,the inefficient and ineffective implementation of the teacher supervision process by the school principals can be seen as a result of the teachers' inability to be supervised as a whole and based on the understanding of professional assistance and guidance.

Sullivan and Glanz (2015) emphasized that teacher supervision has become the most important and fundamental part of effective and efficient teaching and learning processes today. Thus, it is very important that the school principal, as an effective teaching leader, has the necessary knowledge and skills in the field of education and training evaluation. It is extremely important in terms of teacher supervision that the school principal has instructional supervision skills that will contribute to the professional development of teachers. In this sense, Grizzard (2007) stated that for the success of schools, there is a need for principals who will focus on teaching and provide vocational guidance to teachers in the classrooms. Bennet (1995) emphasized that supervisors should have knowledge and experience in their field, and that when teachers are supervised by experts in their field, vocational guidance increases, thus increasing their performance and causing them to be more respected. Wahnee (2010) stated that instructional supervision is an important component of a successful, well-managed school, and that principals who will take part in teacher supervision should receive training in the field of supervision in order to gain competence. School principals should have

the knowledge and skills to carry out professional development activities for teachers in the field of supervision. It cannot be said that school principals in our country have the qualifications to determine the instructional performance of teachers. The main reason for this is; principals are not ready to fulfill their appropriate instructional supervisory roles regarding their instructional supervisory roles and competencies.

Although there is no system and program for training administrators in our country, high level qualifications are expected from administrators in many school-related subjects. It is not defined as a profession in the field of educational administration in Turkey. The human resources of a school principal are only teachers according to the law. Teachers who have not received any training in the field of educational administration and supervision can be appointed to schools as administrators. It can be said that this type of assignment method is far from being scientific. All teachers are accepted as potential manager candidates. It is ignored that managerial qualifications and training should be different and that management is a separate field (Goldberg, 2001; Gürbüz, Erdem, & Yıldırım, 2013). Usta and Ozmusul (2017) stated that 60.9% of school principals stated that they "never" received management training. In the same study, the rate of school principals who stated that they "never" received instructional leadership training was 64.1%. These results can be expressed as an important quality problem regarding the professional competencies of school principals. When the situation is evaluated in terms of the education system of our country, it is very important to adopt a system based on competence and merit in the training and appointment of school principals. It can be said that one of the most important reasons for the problems revealed in this research is the fact that educational administration is not legally specified as a field of expertise in our country.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Some suggestions can be offered based the results of this study. Participants used a total of 130 metaphors in response to"scenario sketches" representing 4 supervision styles based on "School-Based Supervision Approaches Scale". It was

found that 77% of the metaphors had negative meanings and 23% had positive meanings. It was observed that teachers hada negative perception of school principals' supervision approaches related to "Authority-oriented supervision", "Social network-based supervision" and "Transactional supervision" sub-dimensions. Teachers identified the principal figure in their supervision approaches in the scenarios with metaphors such as "dictator, bureaucratic principal, authoritarian, favorite, acrobat, unprofessional, guard, boss, crone-sergeant, unqualified, despotic, destructive principal, commanding-judgmental principal". In contrast, all of the 30 metaphors used by the teachers regarding the "Development-oriented supervision" were used positively, and it was concluded that they had a positive perception for this approach. Participants used metaphors for the supervisor's approach to the "development-oriented supervision" sub-dimension, such as the guide and guiding person, the pole star, the guidance teacher, the traffic sign, the lighthouse, the father of the principal and the opera conductor.

The examination of the metaphors used by the participants in the study revealed that the number of negative metaphors was higher than positive metaphors. It can be said that this negative approach was due to two main reasons: the perception of negative beliefs about supervision and school principals in society and individuals, and the lack of supervisory knowledge and skills of school principals.

If the school principals have the competencies to make a professional and objective evaluation, a positive perception will be formed towards the school principals who are required to supervise the teachers due to their supervisor role.

Positive perceptions towards the course supervision can only be possible if it is fulfilled satisfactorily by the principals and if principals have knowledge, skills and equipment about supervision. It can be said that the lack of knowledge and experience in instructional supervision is the most important problem for the effective course supervision, due to the fact that the principals have not received any training in the field of supervision. Unquestionably, supervision is an area of expertise, and as principals have not received a training, the achievement of supervisory goals in schools is difficult and problematic. The lack of a training program to develop supervisory competence for school principals in Turkey is a deficiency.

Teachers have an absolute need for supervision to make a difference in their professional lives. It is necessary to provide an understanding that focuses on the teacher's needs or expectations. It is also necessary to ensure that school principals have the expertise in order to successfully perform their instructional supervision duties. It seems that the Ministry of National Education in Turkey's assumption that school principals have such a competency hinders an approach that will contribute to supervision process

Instructional supervision practices should be redefined and restructured as a distinct area of expertise in order to provide the professional guidance services needed by teachers. Educational programs to improve supervisory competence should be offered for school principals.

In order to achieve the educational supervision goals, the negative assumptions underlying the beliefs and cultural behaviors about supervision and principals should be investigated and changed. Therefore, in order to supervise teachers efficiently and effectively due to the instructional supervisory roles of school principals, contemporary teaching and learning philosophy, the approach to the teacher, the student, the information and the teaching-learning process should be updated accordingly.

References

Akan, Durdagi, et al. "Teachers' Metaphoric Impressions Related to School Manager." *Elementary Education Online*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2014, pp. 169-79.

Akan, Durdagi, and Sinan Yalçın. "The Investigation of Relationship between the Leadership Style School Principals' and Teachers' Organizational Commitment Level." *Journal of Education and Humanities: Theory and Practice*, vol. 6, no. 11, 2015, pp. 123-50.

Akan, Durdagi, and Mehmet Ali Yarım. "Metaphorical Perceptions of Primary School Students Regarding the Conceptions of School and School Head." *Düzce University*

Journal of Social Sciences, vol. 9, no. 2, 2019, pp. 223-33.

Akbaşlı, Sait, et al. "Analyzing the Metaphorical Perceptions of Secondary Education Students Related to the Variables of School Principal and Teacher." *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, vol. 9, no. 16, 2018, pp. 1566-85.

Arnett, Ronald C. "Metaphorical Guidance: Administration as Building and Renovation." *Journal of Educational Administration*, vol. 37, no. 1, 1999, pp. 80-89.

Arslan, A., and A. Aslan. "Various Views of Turkish Teachers on Educational Supervision." *Journal of Language and Literature Education*, vol. 3, no. 15, 2015.

Aslan, Osman, et al. "Metaphorical Perceptions of High School Students Regarding School Principal." Science Harmony, vol. 1, no. 1, 2018, pp. 11-17.

Balcı, Ali, et al. "Turkish Teachers' and Supervisors' Metaphorical Perceptions About Supervisors." *Educational Research*, vol. 2, no. 10, 2011, pp. 1602-10.

Bennett, Debra Dew. "The Role of Content Knowledge in Instructional Supervision." *Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators,* 1995.

Berg, Bruce L., and Howard Lune. *Qualitative Research Methods in the Social Science*. Education Library, 2019.

Boydak Özan, Mukadder, and Gonul Şener. "Examination of Supervision-Related Perceptions and Expectations of Classroom Teachers through Metaphors." *Journal of Educational Sciences*, vol. 41, 2015, pp. 19-33.

Britton, J. Paula, et al. "Presenting Workshops on Supervision: A Didactic – Experiential Format." *Counselor Education and Supervision*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2002.

Bryman, A. *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University, 2004.

Bülbül, Tuncer, et al. "School-Based Assessment Perception: A Descriptive Analysis Study based on Teacher Opinions." *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practices*, vol. 13, no. 4, 2013, pp. 2105-24.

Cerit, Yusuf. "Opinions of Students, Teachers and Administrators on Metaphors Related to the Concept of Principal." *Education and Science*, vol. 33, no. 147, 2010, pp. 3-13.

Çobanoğlu, Necati, and Serkan Gökalp. "Metaphoric Perceptions of Teacher Candidates for School Managers." *Journal of Mustafa Kemal University Institute of Social Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 31, 2015, pp. 279-95.

Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Research Methods: Qualitative Research and Research Design According to Five Approaches*. Political Bookstore, 2016.

Creswell, John W. *Introduction to Mixed Method Research*. Pegem Publishing, 2017.

Creswell, John W., and Vicki L. Plano Clark. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Sage Publishing, 2018.

Cokluk, Ömay, et al. *Multivariate Statistics for Social Sciences: Applications of SPSS and LISREL*. Pegem Publishing, 2018.

Demir, Mehmet, and Turkay Nuri Tok. "Educational Supervision According to Graduate Student Opinions." *Journal of Trakya University Faculty of Education*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2016, pp. 102-25.

Demirtaş, Zulfu, and Gokhan Kahveci. "Metaphorical Perceptions of Pre-service Teachers on the Concepts of Supervision, Supervisor and Superintendent." *Journal of Education and Humanities: Theory and Practice*, no. 11, 2015, pp. 23-58.

Davies, Deborah, and Peter Rudd. *Evaluating School Self-Evaluation*. National Foundation for Educational Research, 2001.

Dinç, Musa. *Metaphorical Analysis of School Principals' Views on Education Inspectors (Example of Denizli City Center Edendi District)*. Pamukkale University, 2016.

Dobbelaer, Marjoieine, et al. "The Impact of Feedback Training for Inspectors." *European Journal of Training and Development*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2013, pp. 86-104.

Döş, İzzet. "Metaphor Perceptions of Prospective Teachers Regarding the Concept of Inspectorship." *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2010, pp. 607-29.

Dufor, Richard, and Timothy Berkey. "The Principal as Staff Developer." *Journal of Staff Development*, vol. 16, no. 4, 1995.

Ertürk, Ramazan, and Nuri Akgün. "Teachers' Perceptions of Principal and Deputy Principal Concepts: A Metaphor Study." *EJER Congress,* 2020.

Field, S. *Screenplay: Basic Principles of Screenwriting*. Alpha Printing and Publishing, 2016.

Feilzer, Martina. "Doing Mixed Methods Research Pragmatically: Implications for the Rediscovery of Pragmatism as a Research Paradigm." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2010, pp. 6-16.

Glanz Jeffrey, et al. "Impact of Instructional Supervision on Student Achievement: Can we make the Connection?." *Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association*, 2007.

Glickman, Carl D., et al. *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*, translated by Aksu, Mualla Bilgin, and Esmahan Ağaoğlu, Anı Publishing, 2014.

Goldberg, Mark F. "Leadership in Education: Five Commonalities." *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 82, no. 10, 2001, pp. 757-61.

Göksoy, Suleyman, and Zeynep Öztürk. "Opinions of Administrators and Teachers on the Applicability of the Clinical Supervision Model in Vocational and Technical Anatolian High Schools." *Elementary Education Online*, vol. 17, no. 4, 2018, pp. 1830-46.

Grizzard, Tammy. *The Impact of Instructional Leadership on School Climate: A Model for Principal and Teacher Improvement*. Tennessee State University, 2007.

Gümüşeli, Ali İiker. *Education and Training Management*. Pegam Publishers, 2014.

Gürbüz, Ramazan, et al. "The Characteristics of Successful School Principals." *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education,* vol. 20, 2013, pp. 167-79.

Heffernan, Amanda. "The 'Punk Rock Principal': A Metaphor for Rethinking Educational Leadership." *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, vol. 51, no. 2, 2019, pp. 117-32.

Hernández-Amorós, Maria. J., and Maria A. Martínez Ruiz. "Principals' Metaphors as a Lens to Understand how they Perceive Leadership." *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, vol. 46, no. 4, 2018, pp. 602-23.

Hofman, Roelande H., et al. "School Self-Evaluation and Student Achievement." *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2009, pp. 47-68.

Hogler, Raymond, et al. "Meaning in Organizational Communication: Why Metaphor is the Cake, not the Icing." *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2008, pp. 393-412.

Hsieh, Chin-Lin, and Jianpong Shen. "Teachers', Principals' and Superintendents' Conceptions of Leadership." *School Leadership & Management*, vol. 18, no. 1, 1998, PP. 107-21.

Buşiness, Engin, and M. Semith Summak. "A Scale Development Study to Identify School Principals' School-Based Supervision Approaches." *OPUS International Journal of Society Studies*, vol. 18, no. 40, 2021.

Inbar, Dan E. "The Free Educational Prison: Metaphors and Images." *Educational Research*, vol. 38, no. 1, 1996, pp. 77-92.

Johnson, Lynne C. *Better Hope your Teachers likes You: Student Perceptions of Good Teachers and Good Principals*. The University of North Carolina, 2006.

Karabay, Hakan. *Aspects of School Directors 'Inspection Course their Contributions to their Vocational Development Teachers*. Yeditepe University, 2014.

Kaya, Caglar, and Umit Demir. "Metaphoric Perceptions of Education Supervisors on School Principals on the Basis of Institutional Supervision (The Example of Muğla Province)." *International Participation Educational Supervision Congress*, 2010.

Kaya, Metin. "Analysis of Perceptions about School Principal Concepts: Example of a Participant Dictionary Phenomenon Ekşi Sözlük." *Eurasıan Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2020, pp. 70-81.

Kaya, Metin, and Irfan Koca. "Examining the

Metaphor Studies Related to the Concept of School Principal: A Meta-synthesis Study." *Critical Reviews in Educational Sciences*, vol. 1, 2020, pp. 23-38.

Koçak, Serdar, and Salih Pasha Memişoğlu. "The Effect of Supervision of School Principals on Teachers' Professional Development." *Kastamonu Journal of Education*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2020, pp. 806-19.

Korkmaz, İsa. "Investigation of the Effectiveness of School Directors and Inspectors in the Professional Development of Teachers." *The Journal of International Education Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 4, 2015, pp. 55-64.

Korkmaz, Mehmet, and Mehmet Sabir Çevik. "Metaphoric Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers on the Concept of Principal." *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, vol. 11, no. 4, 2018, pp. 973-1002.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors: Life, Meaning and Language*, translated by Demir, Gokhan Yavuz, 2005.

Lee, Alison, and Bill Gren. "Supervision as Metaphor." *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 34, no. 6, 2009, pp. 615-30.

Levin, Barbara B. *Case Studies of Teacher Development: An In-depth Look at how Thinking about Pedagogy Develops Over Time*. Routledge, 2003.

Lincoln, Yvonna S., and Egon G. Guba. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage, 1985.

Linn, Genie B., et al. "Making Meaning of Educational Leadership: The Principalship in Metaphor." *NASSP Bulletin*, vol. 91, no. 2, 2007, pp. 161-71.

Lum, B. Jeannie. "Student Mentality: Intentionalist Perspectives about the Principal." *Journal of Educational Administration*, vol. 35, no. 3, 1997, pp. 210-18.

Melenyzer, Beverly J. "Teacher Empowerment: The Discourse, Meanings and Social Actions of Teachers." *Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education*, 1990.

Memduhoğlu, Hasan Basri, and Muhammad Mehmet Mazlum. "The Story of Change: The Metaphoric Perceptions about Education Supervisors." *Trakya University Journal of Education*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2014, pp. 28-47.

Memişoğlu, Salih. Pasa, and Zeki Ekinci. "Supervisor and Administrator Opinions Relating to Encountered Problems during the Foundation Supervision of Elementary Schools." *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2013, pp. 206-12.

Morgan, David L. "Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained: Methodological Implications of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2007, pp. 48-76.

Al-Najran, Noufa, and Ajantha Dahanayake. "A Requirements Specification Framework for Big Data Collection and Capture." *New Trends in Databases and Information Systems*, edited by Morzy, Tadeusz, et al., Springer, 2015, pp 12-19.

Nolan James, and Linda A. Hoover. *Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: Theory into Practice*. John Wiley and Sons, 2005.

Oyman, N., and S. Turan. "New Assigned School Principals' Opinions on Preparation and Training Programs for School Principalship." *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2014.

Orücü, Deniz. "Pre-Service Teachers' Metaphors towards School, School Administrators and Turkish Education System." *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2014, pp. 327-58.

Özan, Mukadder Boyadak. and Gonul Şener. "Examination of Supervision-Related Perceptions and Expectations of Classroom Teachers through Metaphors." *Journal of Educational Sciences*, vol. 41, no. 41, 2015, pp. 19-33.

Ozan, Mukadder Boydak, and Tuncay Yavuz Ozdemir. "Psychological Pressure of Supervision on Teacher." *International Participation Educational Supervision Congress Proceedings*, 2010.

Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Pegem Publications, 2014.

Pesen, Ata, et al. "2nd Grade Department of Child Development Students' Metaphor Perceptions in Relation to the Concept of Principal." *Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 2015.

Perryman, Jane. "Inspection and Emotion." *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2007, pp. 173-90.

Sergiovanni, Thomas, and Robert Starratt. *Supervision a Redefinition*. McGraw-Hill, 2006.

Schechter, Chen, et al. "Leadership Metaphors: School Principals' Sense-Making of a National Reform." *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2018, pp. 1-26.

Sullivan, Susan, and Jeffrey Glanz. *Supervision that Improves Education and Training in Schools*, translated by Unal, Ali, Anı Yayıncılık, 2015.

Sönmez, Isil, and Kamile Özer Aytekin. "Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute." *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, vol. 36, 2020.

Tüzel, Emel, and Demet Şahin. "Elementary School First Level Students' Metaphors About School Directors." *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, vol. 7, no. 17, 2014, pp. 355-96.

Şahin, Ahmet, and Ali Sabancı. "Perceptions of Pedagogical Formation Students Regarding Education Inspectors: A Metaphor Study." *e-International Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2018, pp. 83-101.

Şahin, Ahmet, et al. "Secondary School Teachers' Opinions on Classroom Inspection." *Asia Studies*, vol. 4, no. 13, 2020.

Taymaz, Haydar. *Inspection in the Education System*. Pegem Publishing, 2010.

Teddlie, Charles, and Abbas Tashakkori. *Fundamentals of Mixed Method Research*. Anı Publishing, 2015.

Tekin, Aykar, and Seda Yılmaz. The Metaphoric Perceptions about "Inspection" of Primary and Secondary Schools' Teachers." *International Journal of New Trends in Arts, Sports & Science Education,* vol. 1, no. 4, 2012, pp. 36-44.

Terry, Paul M. "Empowering Teachers as Leaders." *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1999.

Thrupp, Martin. "Exploring the Politics of Blame: School Inspection and its Contestation in New Zealand and England." *Comparative Education*, vol. 34, no. 2, 1998, pp. 195-209.

Töremen, Faith, and Izzet Döş. "Metaphorical Perceptions of Primary School Teachers about the Concept of Inspectorship." *Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice*, vol. 9, no. 4, 2009.

Tunç, Binali, et al. "Multi-Component Evaluation in Education: Participation of Parents in Performance Evaluation of School Administrators." *Journal of Trakya University Faculty of Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2013, pp. 90-99.

Turkey School Administrators Report. 2019.

Tüzel, Emel, and Demet Şahin Kalyon. "Classroom Teacher Candidates' Metaphors Regarding School Administrators." *Turkish Studies*, vol. 12, no. 33, 2017, pp. 501-22.

Tvnavcevic, Anita, and Silva Ronceli Vaupot. "Exploring Aspiring Principals' Perceptions of Principalship: A Slovenian Case." *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2009, pp. 85-105.

Vaiz, Osman, et al. "Metaphorical Perceptions of Teachers on Education Supervisors." *Folklore / Literature*, vol. 25, no. 97, 2019.

Usta, Mehmet Emin, and Mustafa Ozmusul. "Determination of Principals' Attitudes Towards Education and Schools Administration in Urfa." *Journal of European Education*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2017.

Wahnee, Robbie L. *The Effect of Instructional Supervision on Principal Trust*. University of Oklahoma, Norman, 2010.

Yalçın, Mikail, and Aysun Erginer. "Metaphoric Perception of Principals in Primary Schools." *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2012, pp. 229-56

Yıldırım, Nail. "A Comparative Study on the Images of Education Supervisor and Ministry Supervisor." *Educational Management in Theory and Practice*, vol. 18, no. 1, 2012, pp. 143-66.

Yıldızlı, Hulya, et al. "A Meta-Synthesis Study on Metaphor Studies on the Concept of Teacher

in Turkey." *Education and Science*, vol. 43, no. 193, 2018.

Zembat, R., et al. "Metaphor Study on Preschool Teacher Candidates' Perceptions on the Concept of School Administrator." *Journal of Hacettepe University Faculty of Health Sciences*, 2015.

Zepeda, Sally J. *Instructional Supervision Implementation Tools and Concepts*. Pegem Publishing, 2016.

Author Details

Engin İs, *Mardin Artuklu University, Turkey, **Email ID**: enginis47@.gmail.com*

M. Semmih Summak, *Gaziantep University, Turkey, **Email ID**: summaksemih@gmail.com*