Postgraduate Students' Perceptions of Supervisor and Qualifications that is Sought in the Supervisor Selection

İsmail Keskin[1,*], Taha Yazar[1] & Behçet Oral[1]

[1]Ziya Gokalp Faculty of Education, Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Türkiye

*Correspondence: Ziya Gokalp Faculty of Education, Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Türkiye. Tel: 90-546-724-5758

Abstract

In postgraduate education, the supervisor is a very important actor in terms of the quality of the education process. Therefore, how graduate students perceive supervisor is important in terms of the quality of the educational process. In this study, it was aimed to determine the postgraduate students' perceptions of supervisor and qualifications sought in the selection of supervisor. It is thought that determining how the supervising faculty members are perceived by postgraduate students and what the criteria are for the selection of supervisors may contribute to the field in terms of understanding the student and supervisor relationship on an academic basis in postgraduate education. This research is a qualitative study. The phenomenological design was used in the study. 51 postgraduate students studying in various departments at Dicle University, Institute of Educational Sciences participated in the study in the 2017-2018 academic year. As the data collection tool, a semi-structured interview form was developed by the researchers and used in the study. According to research findings, the criteria that graduate students want to consider in the selection of supervisors are seen as "Having a good command of subject", "Good communication skills", "Guidance", "Close to my field of interest", "Openness to innovation", "Having the knowledge of method", "Entrepreneur", and "Experienced". The findings of this research can be used in supervisor training programs to be organized in the field of graduate education. Research can be conducted to examine the expectations of the supervisor from the graduate students.

Keywords: graduate education, phenomenology, metaphor, supervisor perception

1. Introduction

In today's world, there is a strong relationship between the development levels of countries and their source of qualified human force. Undoubtedly, universities play a very important role in training/educating qualified manpower. Universities are institutions that have a wide range of authorities, responsibilities, and duties such as conducting high-quality scientific research, disseminating scientific data, contributing to national and global development, and producing science and technology. Universities, as institutions at the top of the education system, have to be a part of life and society in many fields (Tuzcu, 2003).

The history of higher education in Turkey can be traced back to the Darülfünun established in 1863. However, this institution was closed many times for various reasons, also reopened in 1870, 1874, 1900, and 1908. In 1923, it was opened as Darülfünun of Istanbul and continued until the 1933 University reform. From this date on it was named as Istanbul University and many structural innovations were made. The year 1946 is considered a turning point in the history of Turkish higher education. With the Law (No. 4936) entered into force that year, universities gained autonomy in administration, including the power to elect a rector and dean. After the 1950 elections, new universities were opened in the American Land Grant model with the belief that the qualified technical personnel needed by the country would be better trained within the framework of this model. These universities: Ege University (1955), Karadeniz Technical University (1955), Middle East Technical University (1956) and Atatürk University (1957) were designed as campus universities.) With the 120th article of the 1961 Constitution, universities were tried to be given administrative and scientific autonomy. However, after the military memorandum of March 12, 1971, some limitations were brought to the autonomy of universities with the new regulation made with the new law (No. 1488) accepted on 20.9.1971. Then the Higher Education Law (No. 2547) came into effect in 1981. This Law has been

considered one of the most comprehensive higher education provisions since the 1933 reform. The 1982 university reform was carried out in an extraordinary period of economic, political, social and cultural turmoil in Turkey. The Higher Education Law No. 2547 or the higher education system projected by this law has been written and discussed in favour of or against by people from almost all walks of life, since the day it was made within the scope of university reforms. As there has been no formal postgraduate education program within the body of universities since the establishment of Turkish Republic, this type of education hasn't been open to people who are not researchers (research assistants). This program is allocated to those who have completed their bachelors and they are determined as assistant candidates from among promising ones in the academia. The program is usually carried out as a master-apprentice relationship under the guidance of a professor and completed with a Ph.D. dissertation. During the period between 1970-1982, postgraduate education was graded as master's and doctorate, taking the USA as a model in postgraduate education, and the condition of writing a thesis was introduced. In the post-1982 period, institutes were established for master's and doctorate education, and postgraduate studies were linked to postgraduate education regulations together with the institutes. Later on, with the introduction of the "master's degree" requirement, postgraduate education was given a two-stage structure as "Master's" and "Ph.D". According to the Article 65, paragraph 13/b in the Higher Education Law (No. 2547), it was decided to regulate the principles of postgraduate education with the Regulation to be issued by the Interuniversity Board (Arslan, 2005; Başar, 1996; RG, 1981; Yazar & Averbek, 2018).

In today's Turkey, postgraduate education proceeds as follows. Master's programs are carried out in two ways: master's with thesis and master's without thesis. Candidates must have a bachelor's degree and an ALES score to be determined by the senate, not less than 55 points in the score type of the program they are applying for (YÖK, 2020). The master's program with thesis enables students to gain the ability to access, compile, interpret and evaluate information using scientific research methods. The thesis supervisor is selected from among the faculty members who have the qualifications to be determined by the relevant department. The master's program without thesis teaches students how to use the existing knowledge in practice by providing information on professional issues. The doctoral program equips students with the necessary skills to conduct independent research, to interpret and analyse scientific problems and data with a broad and deep perspective, and to reach new syntheses. In order to be admitted to the doctoral program, candidates must have a master's degree with thesis and must have an ALES score determined by the relevant senate decision, provided that it is not less than 60 points in the type of score of the program they are applying for. In addition, it is necessary to get at least 55 points from the language exams accepted by YÖK (YÖK, 2021).

The postgraduate education process is carried out in two stages as the course period and the thesis period. Supervisors make important contributions to both in the stages of course selection and writing of the thesis. Some definitions of supervisor are given below. Winston and Polkosnik (1984) define supervisors as "faculty members who guide postgraduate students through their education programs and act as evaluators in written and oral exams and dissertations" (p. 288). Holland (1998) defines a supervisor, either appointed by a department or selected by a student, as a faculty member who is typically responsible for conveying key department procedures, policies, and expectations. According to Holland (1998), the supervisor "typically signs the necessary documents that the student may need from the department staff during his/her doctoral studies". Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, and Hill (2003) describe the supervisor more generally as "the faculty member having the biggest responsibility for guiding the student through the postgraduate program".

Effective academic supervision at the doctoral level plays a critical role in determining whether students will complete their degree or not (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988). In a study by Jacks, Chubin, Porter, and Connolly (1983), it was determined that 44% of the students who entered the thesis stage but did not submit their thesis cited poor relationships with their supervisors or committee members as one of the main reasons for not completing their degree. Similarly, O'Bara (1993) found that among 123 Ph.D. holders and 107 non-graduates, those who completed described more positive interactions with their supervisors than those who could not. Another notable finding from O'Bara's (1993) study is that the personality traits of supervisors are extremely important in distinguishing between completers and non-completers. In particular, those who completed their thesis, rated their supervisors as more accessible, helpful, and sympathetic than those who could not. Golde (2000) also recognized the critical role that supervisors play in helping doctoral students complete their degrees. Golde (2000) interviewed 58 doctoral students who did not complete their education and determined that student-supervisor relationships had problematic characteristics stemming from incompatible expectations and working styles.

It is seen that there are some studies in the literature on academic supervision. In the study conducted by Çakıcı (2006), postgraduate students evaluated their supervisors with low scores on research methods. Also, findings

showed that students were more successful when their opinions were taken in the selection of supervisor. In the study conducted by Demirdelen Alrawdıeh and Yazıt (2021), it was concluded that the students generally got on well with the faculty members and had a good relationship, but they could not get full satisfaction from the quality of education. The metaphors produced by research assistants about their supervisors were evaluated by Gülmez and Kozan (2017), and 7 categories were determined, respectively, as polar star/enlightening, supporter/protector, productive, manager, objective, colonialist and changeable. A research conducted by Seçkin, Aypay, and Apaydın (2014) showed that relaxed personality of the supervisor is more important according to the female students, and "knowing the student" and "allocating time" for the students are more important for doctoral students than for master's students. Again, in a study by Seçkin, Apaydın, and Aypay (2012), the structure of the department and academic supervision are more important than the climate in acquiring the norms according to the graduate students. While doctoral students create a more friendly climate in the education process, master's students are of the opinion that a more formal climate is formed. According to the findings from the research conducted by Bakıoğlu and Gürdal (2001), supervisors do not give written feedback, they do not become members of scientific institutions and organizations, supervisors dictate, and it is felt that there is a shortage of experts. According to Karaman and Bakırcı (2010), the factors such as the heavy workload at the undergraduate level, the high number of students for the supervisors, the inability to allocate sufficient time for students, and the lack of qualifications in the appointment of supervisor lower the quality of postgraduate education in Turkey. Alabaş, Kamer, and Polat (2012) determined that teachers' expectations from postgraduate education are personal development, easing the professional seniority and being an academic staff. In his research, Dilci (2019) determined some problems with the entry requirements to postgraduate education, readiness levels of the supervisors and students, instructional dimension of the learning environments, the course contents and the general qualifications of the written theses. Houdyshell and Kirk (2018) in their study with eight master's students and one doctoral student, determined that participants considered academic supervision as important in general, and the most repeated theme was seeing "the supervisor as a resource and guide". Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) showed that supervision and the academic work of the supervisors were important factors that positively affected students' satisfaction at university. In the study conducted by Lowe and Toney (2000), it was determined that academic supervision is an important factor affecting student satisfaction. In the research conducted by Zhao, Golde, and McCormick (2007), doctoral students indicated that the supervisor's reputation was the first choice in their selection of supervisor. Secondly, they stated intellectual unity and thirdly, personal benefit. In the same research, the themes on which the opinions of their supervisors are concentrated are listed as academic supervision, personal communication, career development and cheap labour, respectively. In the research conducted by Barnes, Williams, and Archer (2010) on the positive and negative characteristics of supervisors, doctoral students counted accessible, helpful, compassionate and socializing as positive qualities; and being inaccessible, useless, and indifferent as negative features.

In this study, it was aimed to determine the postgraduate students' perceptions of supervisor and qualifications sought in the selection of supervisor. It is thought that determining how the supervising faculty members are perceived by postgraduate students and what the criteria are for the selection of supervisors may contribute to the field in terms of understanding the student and supervisor relationship on an academic basis in postgraduate education.

In this context, the aim of this research is to determine the postgraduate students' perceptions of supervisor and the qualifications sought in the selection of supervisor. For this purpose, following questions were asked to postgraduate students:

1. What metaphors do postgraduate students use in defining the concept of supervisor?

2. What are the views of postgraduate students about their communication with their supervisor during the education process?

3. What are the criteria that postgraduate students consider when choosing a supervisor, if the choice is left entirely to them?

4. What are the expectations of postgraduate students from postgraduate education?

2. Method

2.1 Research Model

This research is a qualitative study examining the qualifications that postgraduate students seek in their selection of supervisor and expectations from postgraduate education. The aim of the qualitative research is to produce in-depth

and explanatory information to understand the various dimensions of the problem. The phenomenological design was used in the study. Phenomenology is a method of examining and defining the existence of events and seeking an answer to the question of "what is the truth" (Baş & Akturan, 2013; Creswell, 2012). Studies in this model focus on facts that we are aware of but do not have a deep understanding of them (Şimşek, 2012). Also, data is collected through metaphors in the research. Metaphor can also be considered as a concept that is used outside of its real meaning as a result of interest or analogy. Traditionally, metaphor is defined as the art of rhetoric that enables to explain a concept by making use of the characteristics of another concept (Ortony, 1975). From this point of view, metaphors are used to make the meaning more effective, to enliven the meaning and to express a thought on another concept. According to Morgan (1980), metaphors are of great importance in conceptualizing various phenomena in a creative and memorable way in social sciences as well as in daily life.

2.2 Participants

51 postgraduate students studying in various departments at Dicle University, Institute of Educational Sciences participated in the study in the 2017-2018 academic year. Easily accessible case sampling and criterion sampling method were used to determine the participants. The key criterion in sampling is that the situations to be selected are rich in terms of the information that can be obtained (Keskin & Yazar, 2020). In the study, each participant was coded as "Participant 1 (P1), Participant 2 (P2), ….

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Graduate Students Who are Research Participants

Gender	N
Woman	18
Male	33
Graduate Level	N
Master	25
Doctor	26
Student Attendance Graduate Education Program	N
Curriculum and Instruction	20
Educational Administration Supervision and Planning	8
Mathematics Education	5
History Education	5
Primary Education	4
Social Studies Education	3
Art Education	3
Science Education	3
Your Role	N
Research Assistant	19
Teacher	16
Lecturer	7
Instructor	6
Other	3
Faculty of Graduation	N
Faculty of Education	44
Faculty of Letters	5
Faculty of Science	2

2.3 Data Collection Tool

As the data collection tool, a semi-structured interview form was developed by the researchers and used in the study. Semi-structured interview is a type of tool conducted to collect the same type of information from the participants about the subject to be examined (Şimşek, 2012). The draft was prepared by examining the literature and finalized by

taking the opinions of six experts in the field of educational sciences. By means of the interview form prepared in accordance with this approach, four questions were asked to postgraduate students. The questions included in the data collection tool are as follows:

1. If you were to compare your supervisor to a living or non-living thing, what would you compare him/her to? And why?"

2. Can you tell us about your communication with your supervisor during the postgraduate education consultancy process?

3. If the selection of supervisor was left entirely to you, which criteria would you take into account? Please explain.

4. What are your expectations from postgraduate education?

2.4 Data Collection Process

In this study, the researchers were actively involved in the data collection process. Respondents were interviewed outside the classroom hours. Responding time to the data collection tool took approximately 20-25 minutes. The researchers were careful in order not to influence the participants in the research and to convey all the outcomes obtained in the research to the reader in an unbiased manner. For this reason, the data were collected from the participants in writing, since the participants did not consent to the audio recording and were evaluated as they were. Some direct quotations were included in the data analysis section.

2.5 Data Analysis

The process of analysing and interpreting metaphors was carried out in five stages: (1) identifying metaphors, (2) classification of metaphors, (3) category development, (4) ensuring validity and reliability, and (5) interpretation. In the analysis of the data, content analysis and descriptive analysis techniques were used together. First of all, responses given to the question regarding the metaphor(s) were coded as a list. Then, each metaphor was evaluated in its own context and classified. As a result of this classification, categories were created from the codes in a logical pattern. During this coding, two coders were used to ensure validity and reliability, and it was aimed to ensure reliability between coders. In addition, direct quotations from the responses of the participants are also given in the text.

Content analysis and descriptive analysis were used together in the analysis of the data. In the descriptive analysis, data are summarized and interpreted according to predetermined categories or dimensions. Content analysis, on the other hand, is the process of gathering similar data around certain concepts and themes and arranging them in a clear way (Şimşek, 2012). The responses to each question were coded under these questions with the content analysis technique. The data were also analysed descriptively by taking the frequency of each code and quoting some of the responses given by the participants to the questions.

The "Reliability: Consensus / (Agreement + Disagreement)" formula developed by Miles and Huberman was used to calculate the reliability of the research (Miles & Huberman, 1994). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), if the consistency between the codes of the experts in the studies is 70% and above, it shows that the research is reliable. According to this formula, the reliability coefficient for the first question was calculated as 87%, for the second question as 94%, for the third question as 89% and for the fourth question as 91%. Also, the average reliability coefficient of all questions was calculated as 90.25%. According to these results, it can be said that the research is reliable.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

In the research, the participants were informed about the purpose and subject of the research and consent was obtained for the interviews. Views of the participants were directly conveyed in the findings section. No misleading data collection process was applied to the participants. Information regarding the participants' identities was not included and not requested. In order not to manipulate the results during the analysis of the data, different encoders were included and reliability between encoders was ensured.

3. Findings

In this section, the findings from the data analysis are given.

1. Categories, codes and frequency distributions obtained from postgraduate students' responses to the question "If you were to compare your supervisor to a living or non-living thing, what would you compare him/her to? And why?" are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Codes and Frequency Distributions Obtained from the Postgraduate Students' Responses to the Question "If you were to Compare Your Supervisor to a Living or Non-living Thing. What would you Compare Him / Her to? And Why?"

Category	Code	f	Category	Code	f	Category	Code	f
Supervisor as a guiding/leading person (17)	Guide	3		Umbrella	1	Supervisor as an illuminator (2)	Moon	1
	Map	2		Lifebuoy	1		Lamp	1
	Compass	2	Supervisor as a protector/saviour (6)	Tailor	1	Supervisor as a knowledge store (2)	Computer	1
	Walking stick	1		Shield	1		Google	1
	Directional arrow	1		Cloud	1	Supervisor as Blocker (2)	Wall	1
	Co-pilot	1		Wrench	1		Neutral Element	1
	Traffic sign	1		Tree	1	Supervisor as someone who exhibits unexpected behaviours (2)	Earthquake after shock	1
	Captain	1		Plane tree	1		Dozer	1
	Pole star	1	Supervisor as a useful person (5)	Bee	1	Supervisor as a developer (2)	Sun	1
	Torch	1		Landlord	1		Moon	1
	Coach	1		A Tree Bearing Fruit	1	Supervisor as confirmative (2)	Consul	1
	Moon	1		Mount Everest	1		Noter	1
	Tourist Guide	1	"Supervisor as someone who is inaccessible" (3)	Cactus	1	Supervisor as limiter (1)	Tourist guide	1
Supervisor as Supporter (1)	Fellow traveller	1		Hedgehog	1	Supervisor as a source of love (2)	Father	2

By asking the question "The supervisor is like …. Because …." in the form, the participants were asked to compare their supervisors to a living or non-living thing and explain the reasons for their analogies. The obtained data were analysed and presented in Table 5. The metaphors created by the participants were grouped under certain categories, taking the reason of the analogy into account. The metaphors about the supervisors were grouped under 13 categories. 9 of those categories indicate positive situations about supervisors, while 4 of them indicate different situations. The categories that assign positive roles to supervisors (starting from the highest frequency) are as follows: "Supervisor as guiding/leading person", "Supervisor as a protector/saviour", "Supervisor as an illuminator", " Supervisor as a knowledge store", "Supervisor as a useful person", "Supervisor as a developer", "Supervisor as confirmative", "Supervisor as Supporter" and "Supervisor as a source of love". The categories that assign different roles to the supervisors are listed starting from the category with the highest frequency as follows: "Supervisor as someone who is inaccessible", "Supervisor as blocker", "Supervisor as someone who exhibits unexpected behaviours" and " Supervisor as limiter".

The views of some participants are given below.

P3: The supervisor is like a *guide*. Because I go to him for every question that comes to my mind, and he tries to help me and guide me.

P6: The supervisor is like a co-pilot. Because just as the co-pilot directs the pilot correctly, the supervisor also directs his student.

P21: The supervisor is like a map. Because it shows the way. But it is the student who must walk that path.

P23: A supervisor is like a computer. Because he can answer my every question instantly. Just like a computer, it can access information with the search button.

P29: A supervisor is like a tree. Because it contains useful and beautiful things. The student's job is to catch it and take advantage of it.

P32: The supervisor is like a compass. The supervisor guides and the direction he will show is very important. If it leads to the right place, we go in the right direction, if it leads us wrong, we go in the wrong direction.

P10: The supervisor is like a tourist guide. Because what we see and learn is limited to what he tells.

2. The codes and frequency distributions obtained from the responses to the question "Can you tell us about your communication with your supervisor during the supervision process?" are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The codes and frequency distributions obtained from the students' responses to the question "Can you tell us about your communication with your supervisor during the supervision process?"

Codes	Frequencies
Very good	13
Weak (Less)	11
Friendly-Informal	10
Sincere (24/7 communication	9
Semi-formal	5
Just getting ideas	2
Communication within the limits of love and respect	1

When Table 3 is examined, students' responses to the question "Can you tell us about your communication with your supervisor during the postgraduate education supervision process?" revealed the codes with the highest frequency respectively as follows: "Very good", "Weak (Less)", "Friendly-Informal", "Sincere (24/7 communication)", "Semi-formal", "Just getting ideas" and "communication within the limits of love and respect". The views of some participants are given below.

P7: Our communication is very good because I work at the same university with my supervisor. My supervisor is with me in every trouble, he helps me to solve problems, and constantly encourages me for the continuity of my studies.

P11: Our communication is quite good; I think we understand each other very well. I think the important thing is in this student-supervisor communication. I know some of my friends are having problems with their supervisor.

P29: Since I have just started my education, my relationship with my supervisor is not what I want. Other than that, your supervisor is a bit harsh and cold (in my opinion, of course). That's why I'm a little afraid of him and have a hard time communicating.

P22: Formality did not affect our communication negatively; we had a more friendly communication, and this had a positive effect on my motivation.

P35: My communication with my last supervisor is very good and we can reach each other easily. We follow our work by making good use of technological opportunities. However, I cannot say the same about my previous supervisor. Anyway...

P43: My supervisor was mostly in the guiding position. It expressed the positive and negative aspects of the research I was planning to carry out. Ultimately, he left the decision up to me.

3. The codes and frequency distributions obtained from the responses to the question "If the selection of supervisor was left entirely to you, which criteria would you consider? Are given in Table 4.

When Table 4 is examined, students' responses to the question "If the selection of supervisor was left entirely to you, which criteria would you take into account? Revealed the codes with the highest frequency respectively as follows: "Having a good command of subject", "Good communication skills", "Guidance", "Close to my field of interest", "Sincerity", "Open to innovation", "Having the knowledge of method", "Objective and independent", "Entrepreneur", "Experienced", "Good style of speech", "Tolerant", "Educated abroad" and "Loving to teach". The views of some of the participants are given below.

P3: First, he should be very good in his field, a guide in choosing the thesis topic, a comfortable person in

communication, able to spare time for me, and do her best when I need help.

P11: I would like to choose as a supervisor a person who has good communication skills, can give me sufficient feedback, can give clear feedback, and I can evaluate the results of the study together. However, I did not choose my supervisor.

K24: I would try to choose a supervisor who has high communication skills, has a command of research methods, always keeps his students alive, motivates, has academic competence and experience, and can-do quality studies. However, I did not choose my supervisor. They appointed. However, we were able to meet him at the thesis stage.

P39: I would go to a supervisor who has serious studies and experience on the thesis position I intend to work on. This is the top priority in the thesis.

P45: First, depending on my thesis position, I would choose an advisor that I thought would be more adequate and useful. However, this is not possible in the current system. If we had the chance to choose our thesis topic before the proficiency stage, I would pay attention to the criteria of being useful in terms of accessing resources and related to that subject, which has a command of the subject.

Table 4. The Codes and Frequency Distributions Obtained from Responses to the Question "If the selection of supervisor was left entirely to you, which criteria would you consider?"

Codes	Frequencies
A good command of subject	21
Good communication skills	18
Guidance	15
Close to my field of interest	9
Treating sincerely	8
Open to innovation	6
Having the knowledge of method	6
Objective and independent	5
Entrepreneur	5
Experienced	4
Good style of speech	3
Tolerant	2
Educated abroad	1
Loving to teach	1

4. The codes and frequency distributions obtained from the responses to the question "What are your expectations from postgraduate education? Please explain." are given in Table 5.

When Table 5 is examined, students' responses to the question "What are your expectations from postgraduate education? Please explain." revealed the codes with the highest frequency respectively as follows: "Personal development", "Contribution to scientific development", "Academic career", "Developing in my field", "Gaining a research background", "Being useful in society", "First step in academia", "Building the critical thinking culture", "Networking", "Useless", "Philosophy of life", "Earning a status" and "Having a good education and training process". The views of some participants are given below.

P1: A supervisor who can carry me to the top of my field of convergent development, will enable me to put my signature under publications that will increase my awareness in the field, will provide me with the necessary qualifications to write a good thesis, instil self-confidence, and has a good theoretical background in the field.

P9: Frankly, in my opinion, postgraduate education should aim at gaining a new perspective and experience on my theoretical skills and knowledge related to my undergraduate field. It should transform the scientific foundation laid in undergraduate education to a new stage with postgraduate education. Postgraduate education is the most important goal of being a scientist. Therefore, at this stage, I see it as the most important stage of obtaining information about domestic and foreign resources related to the field.

P14: This process, which I see as a development and learning process; There should be a process that equips me with the knowledge and equipment I will need in the future in my field. As someone who cares and prioritizes the pragmatic and society-facing aspect of science; In this sense, I think that I should gain the necessary awareness and knowledge about how to act in this process.

P21: I can say that I have expectations such as learning to do scientific research, producing academic studies, being able to rise in the profession, and understanding my environment and the world better.

P36: My expectation from graduate education is that it gives me the necessary infrastructure to carry out research that will carry me to higher levels academically and contribute to science.

P47: My biggest expectation is to finish my graduate education on time without prolonging it. However, some of the lessons we took and the contributions of some of our professors could have been better. It seems like it would be a big problem for me, especially if our SUPERVİSOR was appointed without being asked. I would like to work with a consultant with whom I can work more comfortably, with the knowledge, interest, skills and experience I will enjoy working with. My biggest expectation is to achieve the harmony I desire with the consultant or, if not, to continue with a consultant with whom I can work more harmoniously.

Table 5. Codes and Frequency Distributions Obtained from Students' Responses to the Question "What are your expectations from postgraduate education? Please explain."

Codes	Frequencies
Personal development	18
Contribution to scientific development	11
Academic career	10
Developing in my field	9
Gaining a research background	8
Being useful in society	5
First step in academia	3
Building the critical thinking culture	3
Networking	2
Useless	1
Philosophy of life	1
Earning a status	1
Having a good education and training process	1

4. Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The categories obtained from the postgraduate students' supervisor metaphors are seen as follows: "Supervisor as a lodestar", "Supervisor as a protector/saviour", "Supervisor as a useful person", "Supervisor as someone who is inaccessible", "Supervisor as an illuminator", " Supervisor as a knowledge store", "Supervisor as blocker", "Supervisor as a destructor", "Supervisor as a developer", "Supervisor as confirmative", "Supervisor as a source of love", " Supervisor as limiter", and "Supervisor as supporter".   When the literature is examined, no study has been found in Turkey regarding the direct participation of postgraduate students, the perceptions of supervisor and the qualifications sought in supervisor selection. In the research conducted by Gülmez and Kozan (2017), the categories related to the academic supervisor are Venus/Illuminator, Supporter/Protector, Producer, Director and Neutral element. In some international studies, supervisors were described as lodestar and cartographers (Wilsdon, 2014). In the study in which the metaphorical perceptions of teacher candidates regarding the instructors were examined by Yazar (2016), it was found that the instructors were perceived as "a guiding and leading person" by the teacher candidates. When the categories in the research were evaluated, the postgraduate students described the supervisor as a leading person, protector/saviour, useful, inaccessible, enlightener, knowledge store, blocker, destructive, developer, confirmative, source of love and limiter. From among those categories inaccessible, blocking, destructive and limiting are negative categories, while the others are positive ones. In the metaphor research conducted by Doğrul and Yanpar Yelken (2022), it is seen that most of the metaphors produced by postgraduate students about the faculty members teaching them are under the guidance sub-theme. In the research by Limon and Durnalı (2018), in

which the metaphors produced by doctoral students about the lecturers giving doctoral courses were examined, it is seen that the main metaphors produced as guide, compass and friend are similar to the findings of this research. Again, in the research by Limon and Durnalı (2018), it is observed that positive metaphors created for the faculty members predominate. In this context, it can be concluded that postgraduate students evaluate their supervisors more positively. In addition, the guidance aspects of supervisors come to the fore in similar studies.

Postgraduate students' views regarding the experience of communication with their supervisors during the supervision process were grouped as "Very good", "Weak (Less)", "Friendly-Informal", "Sincere (24/7 communication)" and "Semi-formal". As it can be understood from those categories, while most of the students have good communication experience with their supervisors, it is seen that some of them have poor communication experience progressing in a formal manner. Karakütük (2009) stated that postgraduate students had communication problems with their supervisors. In the study conducted by Demir (1995), views of students and supervisors differ in the item of "establishing an easy dialogue". The average of the students in this item is lower than the supervisors. While the supervisors think that they establish an easy dialogue, the students do not agree with this view as much as the supervisors do. In the research conducted by Durmaz (2009), one of the characteristics desired by students in supervisors is the ability to listen. Academic supervisory relationship and supervisor-student communication play an important role on students' success and satisfaction in postgraduate education (Davis, 2010). Eliminating communication problems in postgraduate education can be an important step in improving quality.

The criteria that graduate students want to consider in the selection of supervisors are seen as "Having a good command of subject", "Good communication skills", "Guidance", "Close to my field of interest", "Sincerity", "Openness to innovation", "Having the knowledge of method", "Objective and independent", "Entrepreneur", and "Experienced". Here, it can be said that postgraduate students primarily expect their supervisors to have "a good command of subject", "communication skills" and "high guidance skills". The Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS), developed by Rose (2003), was designed to help postgraduate students evaluate the qualities they value most in a potential supervisor. Item frequencies on this scale showed that two universal characteristics, communication skills and providing feedback, were central to postgraduate students' descriptions of supervisor. In the research carried out by Barnes, Williams, and Archer (2010) on the positive and negative characteristics of supervisors, doctoral students counted accessible, helpful, compassionate, and socializing as positive qualities; and being inaccessible, useless, and indifferent as negative features. Mazerolle, Bowman, and Klossner (2015) concluded in their research that doctoral students develop a relationship based on trust and communication. In the study by Doğrul and Yanpar Yelken (2022), on postgraduate students' expectations from the faculty members, some outcomes supporting the findings of this research were reached. In the related research, expectations from the lecturers, such as "Leading-Proper Guidance", helping "to gain a good command of subject" and "Scientific Literacy and Perspective, "Effective Communication", "Positive and Warm Approach", "Being Tolerant, Patient and Sympathetic" and, "Showing Empathy" are compatible with the supervisor qualifications revealed in this research. In the study conducted by Bıkmaz Bilgen (2022), it was concluded that the main problems that postgraduate students experience with their supervisors are guidance, feedback, and lack of good command of the subject. In addition, the findings of the relevant studies largely overlap with the findings of this research in the context of communication and guidance. As can be seen in some studies (Golde, 2000; Jacks vd., 1983; O'Bara, 1993) conducted with the results of this research, the characteristics of the consultant such as "subject mastery", "effective communication" and "guidance" are important for the sustainability of graduate education.

When the expectations of postgraduate students from postgraduate education were examined, it was seen that the prominent codes are "Personal development", "Contribution to scientific development", "Academic career", "Developing in my field", "Gaining a research background", and "Being useful in society". It was found that expectations of postgraduate students from the postgraduate education are primarily personal development, then contribution to scientific development, and thirdly, having an academic career. In the light of those findings, some similar outcomes are encountered in the literature review. Oluk and Çolak (2005) concluded that teachers who continue their postgraduate education aim to have academic career and gain professional knowledge. Sayan and Aksu (2005) concluded that the purpose of individuals, other than the academic staff, who are doing postgraduate education, is to train themselves in their fields, to become an academician and to make progress in their carriers. Başer, Günhan, and Yavuz (2005) concluded that teachers who continue their postgraduate education do postgraduate studies in order to improve themselves, to be employed and to have an academic career. Savaş and Topak (2005) found that the expectations of postgraduate students are to experience the happiness of obtaining new information, to achieve an academic career, and to gain the opportunity to realize themselves. Arı, Pehlivanlar, and Çömek (2005) reached the responses of "field knowledge" and "career" regarding the expectations of postgraduate

students from the education they receive. In the studies of Ören, Yılmaz, and Güçlü (2012), teacher candidates' views on postgraduate education were examined. According to the findings of the research, teacher candidates who want to receive postgraduate education responded that they can start this education with the aim of improving themselves, specializing in their fields, becoming academic staff and for career needs. In the study carried out by Yazar (2020), it was determined that some prominent factors for students in doing postgraduate education are mostly professional development, building a career, continuous learning, and lifelong learning. Alabas et al. (2012) concluded that teachers started postgraduate education primarily for career development. When the relevant research findings are examined, it is concluded that the expectations compatible with the results of this research such as "development in the field", "making an academic career" and "personal development" come to the fore.

Metaphors of graduate students about supervisor can be examined on larger samples. Research can be conducted to examine the expectations of the supervisor from the graduate students and the metaphors they produce about the graduate students.

As an advanced research proposal, extensive research on the selection of supervisor in postgraduate education and the role of supervisors in postgraduate studies can be conducted on large samples.

The perception of the supervisor and qualifications sought by the postgraduate students in the supervisor selection process can be researched among the post graduate students registered in different fields (Engineering, medicine, social sciences, etc.).

Within the supervisor training programs to be organized in the field of postgraduate education, the following criteria sought by postgraduate students in the supervisor selection can be considered. Those criteria obtained from the findings of this research are: "Having a good command of subject", "Having good communication skills", "Guidance", "Being close to students' field of interest", "Openness to innovation", "Having the knowledge of method", "Being entrepreneurial", and "Being experienced".

References

Alabaş, R., Kamer, S. T., & Polat, Ü. (2012). Master's Degree Education in the Career Development of Teachers: Reasons of Preference and the Problems That They Face throughout the Process. *E-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3*(4), 89-107.

Arı, E., Pehlivanlar, E., & Çömek, A. (2005). Lisansüstü eğitim öğrencilerinin gördükleri eğitim hakkında beklenti ve görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 17*, 231-235.

Arslan, M. (2005). Cumhuriyet dönemi üniverste reformları bağlamında üniversitelerimizde demokratiklik tartışmaları. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1*(18), 23-49.

Bakioğlu, A., & Gürdal, A. (2001). Lisansüstü tezlerde danışman ve öğrencilerin rol algıları: Yönetim için göstergeler. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 21*, 9-18.

Barnes, B. J., Williams, E. A., & Archer, S. A. (2010). Characteristics that matter most: Doctoral students' perceptions of positive and negative advisor attributes. *Nacada Journal, 30*(1), 34-46.

Baş, T., & Akturan, U. (2013). *Nitel araştırma yöntemleri: NVivo ile nitel veri analizi*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Başar, E. (1996). Türk Yükseköğretim Sisteminin Dünü, Bugünü, Yarini. Ondokuz Mayis University *Journal of Education Faculty, 10*(1), 23-57.

Başer, N., Günhan, B., & Yavuz, G. (2005). Ortaöğretim fen ve matematik alanında öğrenim gören yüksek lisans öğrencilerin aldıkları eğitimden beklentileri, yaşadıkları sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* (17), 95-101.

Bıkmaz Bilgen, Ö. (2022). *Lisansüstü Öğrencilerin Tez Danışmanlarıyla Yaşadıkları Sorunlar*. Paper presented at the EJERCongress 2022, İzmir.

Bozan, M. (2012). Lisansüstü eğitimde nitelik arayışları. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi, 4*(2), 177-187.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Daulat Purnama.

Çakıcı, A. C. (2006). Turizm alanında lisansüstü tez hazırlayan öğrencilerin danışman öğretim üyelerini ve danışman öğretim üyelerinin de öğrencileri değerlendirmesi. *Dokuz Eylul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergis, 8*, 74-104.

Davis, D. J. (2010). The academic influence of mentoring upon African American undergraduate aspirants to the professoriate. *The Urban Review, 42*(2), 143-158.

Demir, A. G. (1995). Akademik danışmanların ve öğrencilerin akademik danışmanlık hizmeti ile ilgili değerlendirmelerinin karşılaştırılması. *Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 2*(6), 22-28.

Demirdelen Alrawadıeh, D., & Yazıt, H. (2021). Doktora deneyiminin öğrenciler ve akademisyenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 24*(46), 1229-1245.

Dilci, T. (2019). Eğitim bilimleri örnekleminde lisansüstü eğitimin niteliksel boyutuna ilişkin görüşler (nitel bir çalışma). *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 29*(1), 159-179.

Doğrul, H., & Yanpar Yelken, T. (2022). Öğretim Elemanlarının ve Lisansüstü Öğrencilerinin Birbirlerine Olan Beklentileri ile Metaforik Algılarının İncelenmesi. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies, 9*(1), 1-22.

Durmaz, Ş. (2009). The evaluation of the opinions of Qafqaz University students about "counselling service" and their expectations from "academic supervisors. *Journal of Qafqaz University,* (26), 241-251.

Girves, J. E., & Wemmerus, V. (1988). Developing models of graduate student degree progress. *The Journal of Higher Education, 59*(2), 163-189.

Golde, C. M. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student descriptions of the doctoral attrition process. *The review of higher education, 23*(2), 199-227.

Gülmez, D., & Kozan, H. I. O. (2017). A Study of Research Assistants' Perceptions about Academic Adviser and Academic Life through Metaphors. *Journal of Education and Practice, 8*(7), 96-106.

Higher Education Institution (1981). Higher Education Law, Official Gazette.

Holland, J. W. (1998). Mentoring and the faculty development of African-American doctoral students. *Diversity in higher education, 2*, 17-40.

Houdyshell, M., & Kirk, P. (2018). Graduate students' perceptions' on a professional pathway for academic advisors. *American Journal of Qualitative Research, 2*(1), 77-96.

Jacks, P., Chubin, D. E., Porter, A. L., & Connolly, T. (1983). The ABCs of ABDs: A study of incomplete doctorates. *Improving College and University Teaching, 31*(2), 74-81.

Karakütük, K. (2009). Türkiye lisansüstü öğretim sistemi. In K. Karakütük (Ed.), *Lisansüstü Öğretim.* Sistemleri Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Karaman, S., & Bakırcı, F. (2010). Türkiye'de lisansüstü eğitim: Sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5*(2), 94-114.

Keskin, İ., & Yazar, T. (2020). Nitel Araştırmalarda Örneklem. In B. Oral & A. Çoban (Eds.), *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Eğitimde Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: PEGEM Akademi.

Limon, İ., & Durnalı, M. (2018). Doktora öğrencilerinin doktora eğitimi ve öğretim üyelerine yönelik metaforik algıları. *Sakarya University Journal of Education, 8*(1), 26-40.

Lowe, A., & Toney, M. (2000). Academic advising: Views of the givers and takers. J*ournal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 2*(2), 93-108.

Mazerolle, S. M., Bowman, T. G., & Klossner, J. C. (2015). An analysis of doctoral students' perceptions of mentorship during their doctoral studies. *Athletic Training Education Journal, 10*(3), 227-235.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. London: Sage Publications.

Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving in organization theory. *Administrative science quarterly, 25*(4), 605-622.

O'Bara, C. C. (1993). *Why some finish and why some don't: Factors affecting PhD completion*. The Claremont Graduate University.

Oluk, S., & Çolak, F. (2005). Milli eğitim bakanlığına bağlı okullarda öğretmen olarak çalışan lisansüstü öğrencilerinin karşılaştıkları. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* (17), 141-144.

Ortony, A. (1975). Why metaphors are necessary and not just nice. *Educational theory, 25*(1), 45-53.

Ören, F., Yılmaz, T., & Güçlü, M. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının lisansüstü eğitime yönelik görüşlerinin analizi.

Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1(2), 189-201.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How College Affects Students: A Third Decade of Research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rose, G. L. (2003). Enhancement of mentor selection using the ideal mentor scale. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(4), 473-494.

Savaş, B., & Topak, E. (2005). Lisansüstü öğrenim gören öğrencilerin beklentileri ve lisansüstü öğrenimi talep etme gerekçeleri. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 17*(1), 145-154.

Sayan, Y., & Aksu, H. H. (2005). Akademik Personel Olmayan Lisansüstü Eğitim Yapan Bireylerin Karşılaştıkları Sorunlar Üzerine Bir Çalışma: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Balıkesir Üniversitesi Durum Belirlemesi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi, 17*(1), 59-66.

Schlosser, L. Z., Knox, S., Moskovitz, A. R., & Hill, C. E. (2003). A qualitative examination of graduate advising relationships: The advisee perspective. *Journal of counseling psychology, 50*(2), 178.

Seçkin, M., Apaydın, Ç., & Aypay, A. (2012). Lisansüstü eğitimde normlar: Yapı, iklim ve danışmanlık. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi,* (3), 176-185.

Seçkin, M., Aypay, A., & Apaydın, Ç. (2014). Lisansüstü eğitim alan öğrencilerin akademik danışmanlık hakkındaki görüşleri. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi, 4*(1), 28-35.

Şimşek, A. (2012). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Tuzcu, G. (2003). Lisansüstü öğretim için yurtdışına öğrenci göndermenin planlanması. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 160*, 155-165.

Wilsdon, J. (2014). The past, present and future of the Chief Scientific Advisor. *European Journal of Risk Regulation, 5*(3), 293-299.

Winston, R. B., & Polkosnik, M. C. (1984). Advising graduate and professional school students. In R. B. Winston, T. K. Miller, S. C. Ender, & T. J. Grites (Eds.), *Developmental Academic Advising: Addressing Students Educational, Career, and Personal Needs* (pp. 287-315). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Yazar, T. (2016). *Öğretmen adaylarının öğretim elemanı ile ilgili metaforları*. Paper presented at the 4. Uluslararası eğitim programları ve öğretim kongresi, Antalya.

Yazar, T. (2020). Opinions and suggestions of graduate students about postgraduate education. *Int. Online J. Educ. Sci, 12*, 149-171.

Yazar, T., & Averbek, E. (2018). 1933 Üniversite reformundan günümüze Türkiye'de üniversitelerin tarihsel gelişimi. *Turkish Studies, 13*(4), 1341-1360.

YÖK. (2020). *Lisansüstü Eğitim ve Öğretim Yönetmeliği*. Ankara: Resmi Gazete.

YÖK. (2021). *Lisansüstü Eğitim ve Öğretim Yönetmeliği*. Ankara: Resmi Gazete.

Zhao, C. M., Golde, C. M., & McCormick, A. C. (2007). More than a signature: How advisor choice and advisor behaviour affect doctoral student satisfaction. *Journal of further and higher education, 31*(3), 263-281.