International Journal of Research in English Education (IJREE)

Original Article **Published online: 20 June 2023.**

Proceedings of the First National Virtual Conference on English Language Teaching in the Iranian Mainstream Education System

Investigating Different Types of Supervision on Teaching Practice of EFL Teachers in Iran

Nouzar Gheisari[1], Nouroddin Yousofi[1], & Fatemeh Chaghazardi[1]

* Correspondence:
gheisarinouzar@gmail.com
[1]Department of English Language, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran

Proceedings of the First National Virtual Conference on English Language Teaching in the Iranian Mainstream Education System

Abstract

Familiarity with supervision models has its own constructive effect on both teacher classroom practice and positive classroom outcomes. In this line, this study investigated the pre-service and in-service EFL teachers' attitudes towards prescriptive and collaborative supervision models. For this purpose, 200 participants, 100 pre-service and 100 in-service EFL teachers of schools and institutions in different levels and from both genders were recruited. The participants were selected through simple random sampling and the required data was collected through a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire. To analyze the data, descriptive statistics and chi-square analysis were used. The results demonstrated that both pre-service and in-service EFL teachers had the same attitude towards prescriptive and collaborative models of supervision. Furthermore, most of the teachers of both groups were in agreement with the collaborative model. The results also revealed that gender did not have any significant effect on the preference for already-mentioned models of supervision albeit most of them were in agreement with the collaborative model. The findings of this study can be fruitful for supervisors and teacher mentors in order to inform them with new and more efficient supervision models to improve the teachers' performance and educational programs as well.

Key words: Teacher supervision, prescriptive model, collaborative model, pre-service teachers, in-service teachers

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

1. Introduction

The basic foundation of both an effective school and teacher is educational supervision (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2004). The issue of supervision and the role of supervisor has a significant impact on the development of schools (Kovacevic & Hallinger, 2019). In supervision, the supervisor helps to improve the performance of teachers in teaching and their autonomy by using communicating methods as well as creating motivation and encouragement (Drummer et al., 2018; Lorensius Warman et al., 2021; Mostaghfiroh et al., 2020). Supervision is done with the aim of developing the quality of teachers' teaching as well as developing the learning processes in students (Kaso et al., 2021), and the supervisor with his/her guidance systematically causes that the teachers perform their duties professionally (Muttaqin, 2020).

Supervision is a process through which the supervisor finds and solves educational problems in order to develop efficient education. In the supervising process, the supervisor organizes the training staffs. As a trusted leader, he/she improves the performance of teachers in the classroom. The observer is not an omniscient and free from any mistakes, but acts as a contributing factor to solve educational problems. He/she has often democratic and interactive role, not authoritative and directive (Behlol, Yousuf, Parveen, & Kayani, 2011). Effective supervision helps teachers to shape their teaching behaviors regarding what to do and what not to do and not merely mean that teachers' teaching is wrong (Glickman et al., 2004). Teachers need pedagogical and ethical support. This need is met with the help of supervision. In this way, the problems of teachers' performance can be identified and solved (Kayaoglu, 2012).

Teacher observation is an important part of the educational supervision program (Viriyapanyanont, Kewara, & Prabjandee, 2019). Many reasons prove the necessity of observing the teachers' performance. Therefore, supervision is still necessary since the teachers have not achieved the required level of skillfulness and dynamicity (Zepeda, 2007). The concept of supervision has innovative principles which in case operationalized well can result in emerging positive changes in the schools and the university systems. In this regard, the supervisee has some roles in providing educational management, problem solving, and better performance of teachers in teaching methodologies in the relaxed condition (Ibara, 2013). Through the effective supervision, the teachers are able to improve regarding their performance and their level of teaching knowledge (Veloo, A Kamuji, & Khalid, 2013). Supervision is a formative assessment which draws the quality of teaching, and evaluates teaching and teachers based on some standards (Thomas, 2008). It has positive effects on how to write lesson plans, how to teach the lessons, questioning methods, students' engagements, students' tasks as well as assessing their assignments, and manage the class (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Therefore, educational supervision based on its regular supervision processes, i.e. planning before observing, observing, analyzing, and providing feedback on teachers' teaching behavior, can inform teachers regarding new and efficient teaching strategies and learning complexities (Kayaoglu, 2012).

However, the main issue in supervision goes back to the philosophy of the model by which the supervisor observes the teachers' teaching. Considering this issue, the most used supervision model by supervisors among the already-defined supervision models seems to be PSM (Prescriptive Supervision Model). Employing this model, teacher's teaching is evaluated and directed by systematic analysis. There is no friendly relationship between teacher and supervisor, and just supervisor can talk. So it creates insecure atmosphere for teachers specially newcomer teachers. The evaluator as an authority uses pre-planned rules and rating scales with a written checklist to assess what happens in the teacher's performance. Unlike the PSM, one can offer to the CSM (Collaborative Supervision Model) in which the observer and the teacher have some negotiations together and share their feedback and suggestions. They state the issue of teaching and work on description, examination, and performance stages of that issue. In this model unlike prescriptive model, the supervisor does not direct the teacher (Wallace, 1989).

In schools and most of private-institutions of Iran, there is no proper supervising system and many teachers, especially inexperienced teachers, need help to solve their problems of teaching by supervisor. According to Rahmany, Hassani, and Parhoodeh (2014), supervisors usually use the traditional or prescriptive supervision model. This model has some drawbacks: there is not any friendly relationship between teachers and supervisor. Teachers are not allowed to talk about their problems or they do not have autonomy. The supervisor does not provide constructive feedback in most cases and just focuses on negative parts of the teachers' teaching. It creates stressful atmosphere for teachers which leads to change the teachers' normal performance during teaching. In this model, the supervisor observes the teachers in just one session. In other words, there is no consistency in sessions of this model of supervision (Akpa, 1987;

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

Gursoy, Kenser, & Salihoglu, 2016; Mbonu, 2004). Furthermore, some studies have by far been conducted in Iran, regarding supervision among different groups of teachers in different contexts (Gholaminejad, 2020; Moradi et al., 2014; Rashidi & Foroutan, 2016); however, the results are still sketchy and not adequate enough to provide a road map for better employment of fruitful supervisory models. Therefore the present study was conducted, as it aimed at investigating preference of Iranian pre-service and in-service male and female EFL teachers regarding the type of supervision they prefer. In this line, the following research questions were devised to guide the objectives of this study:

1. Is there any significant difference between Iranian pre-service and in-service EFL teachers in choosing prescriptive model of supervision?

2. Is there any significant difference between Iranian pre-service and in-service EFL teachers in choosing collaborative model of supervision?

3. Does gender as a moderator significantly affect the model of supervision preference?

2. Literature Review

2.1 An Overview on the History of Supervision and Its Different Models

The literature of supervision dates back to the late nineteenth century, when Autocratic supervision or administrative inspection was developed in American colonialism using organizational and administrative purposes (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992). At that time, ministers, non-governmental, and trustee groups were selected as supervisors that observed in the role of administrative inspectors. Later, supervisory responsibilities became widespread in the district-level and school principal (Grimsley & Bruce, 1982). In the late1800, people first appeared as an expert in city schools and classrooms and began to act out their educational supervisory work full time. In the early 1900, this educational observation work extended to rural schools. In those early days, the supervisors visited schools as inspectors to monitor and evaluate the performance of teachers and students in the classroom to see whether they do their duties properly or not. The purpose of this work was for teachers to continue their teaching with the use of the best teaching methods (Grimsley & Bruce, 1982). The educational supervision as a supportive function has different tasks from one school system to another and they have been done and developed gradually. Most of the supervision writers state that an individual who do the observing work is considered a supervisor at that moment. This belief that overseeing is an individual practice has changed gradually, and professionalism emerged and after Autocratic supervision, Efficient, Scientific, and Democratic models of supervision came into being and improved (Grimsley & Bruce, 1982).

In the early twentieth century, the implementation of Democratic supervision models began by Jesse Newlon and in the collaboration with James Hossic (Glanz, 1998). During this period, Democratic supervisory methods were developed in three other models, namely Clinical, Developmental, and Transformational Leadership. The emergence of these extended models has been done after bureaucracy in order to eliminate “inspection supervision” and the development of Democratic models. For instance, school-based management and peer-coach were among the school monitoring models which replaced the Autocratic or inspection supervision (Jeffery, 1994).

After the Democratic model, until the early 1950s, doing participatory activities were given more attention using the clinical supervision model by Morris Cogan (1973) at Harvard University, to develop the professional performance of teachers (Pajak, 2000). According to Goldhammer (1969), one of the main supporters of the Clinical supervision model, this model of observation involves activities and processes which are done with the cooperation and association between the supervisor and the teacher and progress the teachers’ teaching practices. In the clinical supervision model, instead of inspection and fault-finding of teachers’ teaching, which continued this traditional approach until 1960, more collaboration and participation takes place between the teacher and the supervisor. As such, traditional, prescriptive, and judgmental models of observation gave the way to the new clinical model, a model which its main focus was on attendance of supervisor in class and analyzing the teachers’ teaching, teachers’ participation with their supervisor, having the supervisor’s relevant skills to the curriculum, solving the problems of teachers’ teaching by the supervisor, the supervisor’s meaningful relationship with the teachers and providing constructive feedback to them (Mette, et al., 2017).

In the 1980s, commentary of the bureaucracy paved the way for progression of educational supervision (Firth & Eiken, 1982), and caused that observers to continue their supervisory work with other supervising models, such as mentoring,

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

peer-coach, and action research (Sollivan & Glanz.J., 2000). The developmental supervision model was introduced in the early 1980s (Glickman, 1981), and at the end of this decade, the Transformational Leadership observation method gained a lot of support from the supervisors. In this model, the supervisor played a role of making a change in the teachers' training (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990).

Freeman (1982) presented three models of teacher supervision; namely, Supervisory, Alternative, and Non-directive. In the first model (Supervisory), the supervisor in the role of evaluator assesses the teachers' performance, just diagnose the teachers' teaching problems, and prescribe feedback to the teachers. Regarding the second approach (Alternative), the supervisor without considering any pre-planned judgement, if s/he observes non-constructive activities in the already-teaching of teachers, the supervisor suggests a series of alternative activities which will improve the teachers' future performance. The teachers also have no any restrictions in using alternative methods proposed by the supervisor. In Non-directive model, the supervisor provides a condition for the teacher so that the teacher can freely talk about his/her teaching problems and explain some opinions. In better expression, the supervisor acts as a counselor and by listening to the teacher's ideas constantly and patiently, a sense of trust and confidence is created between teacher and supervisor. Finally, the teacher can solve his/her teaching problems.

Following Freeman (1982), after a short period of time, Gebhard (1984) developed three models proposed by freeman into five models including, 1) Directive, 2) Alternative, 3) collaborative, 4) Non-directive, and 5) Creative. In each model, Gebhard presented some suggestions and solutions over teachers' performance, how they should be acted on the best possible ways and finally, evaluate the teachers' teaching practices in the supervisory processes. In 1988, Goldsbery suggested three models of supervision; namely, 1) nominal, 2) correcting or Prescriptive, and 3) Reflective models.

The abovementioned models of supervision have been summarized by Wallace (1989) into two Prescriptive and Collaborative models. In the first model (Prescriptive), the supervisor as an authority or inspector observes and analyzes the teachers' performance with pre-determined checklist and without informing the teachers. Regarding this model, actually, there is no close relationship between teachers and supervisor. The supervisor directs the teachers with sharp criticism and just focuses on the teachers' negative performance with inspection purposes. Concerning the Collaborative model, unlike the Prescriptive model, the supervisor as a friend observes, evaluates, and provides some constructive feedback on the teachers' teaching in three processes: 1) pre-conference, 2) conference, and 3) post-conference. In other words, there is consistency in this model of supervision sessions. The supervisor creates a friendly atmosphere for teachers and have collaboration with them in order that the teachers can talk about their teaching problems freely, and finally, the supervisor presents some solutions and up-to-date resources for them with improvement purposes.

2.2. Empirical studies

Many researches have done their share in the field of teacher supervision and its effect on teachers' teaching in various ways in order to inspect the performance of teachers in the classroom and also to make teachers aware of pre-determined skills. Focusing on instructional supervision in secondary schools in three Asian countries, namely India, Thailand, and Malaysia, Sharma, Yusoff, Kannan, and Binti Baba (2011) concluded that supervision as it is leads to nothing constructive but filling out papers, and punishing teachers.

In the Iranian context of education, one study explored that the current supervision is prescriptive and it has negative effect on teachers' performance (Moradi et al., 2014). Similarly, the results of another major study by Rahmani et al. (2014) demonstrated that using the prescriptive supervision model for experienced teachers does not have positive effect on their progress, albeit this model has positive effect on the less experienced teachers' performance (0-5 years) and they were satisfied with this model. Findings of another study by Rashidi and Foroutan (2016) with the aim of examining the difference between Iranian pre-service and in-service EFL teachers' attitudes toward supervision indicated that there is no difference between their attitudes about supervision to improve the teachers' teaching. In essence, the backbone of this study was very similar to the directive or prescriptive supervision model.

A qualitative study by Aldiahani (2017) regarding exploring the perceptions of head teachers of high school in Kuwaiti toward teacher professional development revealed that supervision is good and it leads to the correction of the wrong performance of teachers in class, but in some cases it should be changed: creating close relationship between teachers

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

and supervisor, conducting supervision in many sessions, and providing feedback to the teachers in order to make them aware of their strengths and weaknesses. Sharma and Ai-Sinawaie (2019) conducted a research in Malaysia regarding the teachers' perceptions toward supervision and found that supervisors mostly do the classroom supervision with the directive model, and supervisors just focus on negative parts of teachers' teaching. They also showed that gender, age, teaching experience, and supervisory experience do not have any effect on teachers' attitudes toward supervision.

A qualitative study by Gholaminejad (2020) was conducted in Iran, the findings of which showed that teachers have negative view toward current supervision for several reasons: 1) supervisors do not create friendly atmosphere for teachers during observation, 2) teachers do not have autonomy in order to present their ideas with their supervisors, 3) there is not any motivation and certain goal for observing teachers, 4) there is no consistency in supervision sessions, and 5) the supervisors' feedback is not suitable to guide teachers. Yao Dewodo et al. (2020) probed the teachers' view of supervision in Ghana and came to the conclusion that supervision is done only with the aim of fault-findings of teachers' teaching and without holding post-conference observation session.

Recently, a mixed-method study by Estaji and Ghiasvand (2022) was conducted in Iran regarding the examination of attitudes of novice and experienced teachers toward supervision. The results revealed that both groups of teachers had the same and negative attitudes toward the current model of supervision. The participants believed that the existing supervision model is done with organizational goal and for the purpose of fault-finding. Moreover, supervision is effective and efficient when teachers are in the early years of their teaching, not at the end of their service. To explore the issue more deeply, and to find out about the degree of familiarity of Iranian EFL teachers with supervision models, the present study was recruited.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study follows the quantitative research design in order to answer the three research questions. To examine the preference of Iranian pre-service and on-the-job EFL teachers of each sex with Prescriptive and Collaborative models of supervision, a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire was distributed among them.

3.2 Participants

A total of 200 English language teachers from different provinces and levels (ranging from elementary to advanced) in different schools and institutions were participated in this study. In this quantitative research, simple random sampling was employed. The participants included 200 pre-service and in-service teachers, 100 of each sex, 50 pre-service and 50 in-service teachers. Their academic degree was heterogeneous, namely BA, MA, PhD, and their majors were mixed, that is (English literature, English translation, Teaching English as a foreign Language).

3.3 Instrument

In order to respond to the first, second, and third research question of the study, a modified version of questionnaire by Rashidi and Foroutan (2016) was sent to 200 teachers, 50 in-service male teachers, 50 in-service female teachers, 50 pre-service male teachers, and 50 pre-service female ones. The questionnaire involved two sections. The first section refers to the demographic information of the participants, including their name, gender, age, academic degree (B.A, M.A, Ph.D.), field of study (English literature, English translation, TEFL), teaching context (public schools, private institutes, or both), and year(s) of teaching experience. The second section included 40 items, 20 on the prescriptive and 20 on the collaborative model which investigated the preference of Iranian pre-service and in-service teachers for prescriptive and collaborative models of supervision. Each item of questionnaire included 5 points that is the questionnaire was based on Likert scale. So, the questionnaire was a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to""strongly disagree." Regarding the content validity of the questionnaire, it was reviewed by three TEFL professors working in universities, and then the questionnaire was modified according to their recommendations. Later, the questionnaire was piloted by 10 English language teachers. Further, to make sure of the reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach's Alpha analysis was employed and the reliability was (.83%) for the questionnaire.

3.4 Data Collection

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

In the present study, the data collection was carried out through simple random sampling. Due to the prevalence of Corona pandemic and the closure of schools and institutions, data collection was not possible in presence. Therefore, the researcher designed an online questionnaire via Google Docs in order to mail it to the participants and collect data. Over the social networks, the pre-service and in-service EFL teachers were informed, and those who showed willingness to participate received the questionnaire through different virtual communication services. The designed questionnaire was given to 200 participants, 100 of each sex, 50 pre-service and 50 on-the-job teachers. The questionnaire included two parts: part A about demographic information of the participants, and part B refers to the teacher supervision questionnaire which it contained 40 questions of which 20 related to prescriptive and 20 other pertinent to collaboration models of supervision. Finally, in order to provide enough information to EFL teachers about the purpose of the study, the researcher asked them to complete the questionnaire carefully. Furthermore, the participants were convinced that their responses would be confidential and would only use for academic purposes.

3.5 Data Analysis

Before analyzing the collected data, the researchers piloted the questionnaire with 10 teachers. Then, the data gathered from piloting processes was entered into SPSS 26 (the Statistical Package for Social Sciences). After that, Cronbach's alpha was carried out to measure the reliability of the responses. In the end, Chi-square tests were employed to determine the significant variation patterns in Iranian EFL teachers' reported ideas about what supervisory model they prefer. These tests compared the actual frequencies in which participants provided various answers on the five-point Likert scale. Through Chi-square tests, answers of 1 and 2 "Strongly agree" and "Agree" were classified into a single category "Agreement"; and the answers of 4 and 5 "Strongly disagree" and "Disagree" were combined into a single " Disagreement" category.

4. Results

4.1 The Difference between Iranian Pre-service and In-service EFL Teachers' Attitudes in Choosing Prescriptive Model of Supervision

In order to answer the first research question, a chi-square test was carried out to understand whether there was a significant difference between pre-service and in-service EFL teachers' attitudes regarding the prescriptive model of supervision. The results in Table 4.1 show the agreement and disagreement of both pre-service and in-service EFL teachers regarding the prescriptive supervision model. The results indicate that 53.05% of pre-service teachers agree with the prescriptive or current model of supervision, while 28.7% of them disagree. On the other hand, among 100 in-service teachers, 45.4% of them agree, but 35.5% disagree. In other words, about fifty percent of both groups have positive attitudes that the supervisors should choose the prescriptive model to observe their teaching performance. However, Table 4.1 shows that the items No (9-13-19-21-22-27-30-33-36-38-40) in both groups got low rates (disagreement), so these items show the negative attitudes of teachers about prescriptive model. Basically, almost half of the teachers of both groups seems to be satisfied with the prescriptive model, but (according to the low rate items) it should be changed in some cases: the supervisors should not present directive feedback; presentation feedback with soft voice; they should not just evaluate the teachers, but also should try to help the teachers' professional development; consistency of supervision sessions; and in order that the teachers follow the supervisors' instructions they should have close and constructive relationship with teachers.

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

Table 1. Percentages of pre-service and in-service EFL teachers' attitudes in choosing prescriptive supervision model (N=200)

	Pre-service Teachers				In-service Teachers			
Items	A(%)	U(%)	D(%)	Total(%)	A(%)	U(%)	D(%)	Total(%)
1	78	14	8	100	83	11	6	100
2	51	25	24	100	67	12	21	100
5	54	23	23	100	63	21	16	100
7	53	20	27	100	55	18	27	100
9	53	20	27	100	46	18	36	100
11	73	16	11	100	68	20	12	100
13	49	28	23	100	46	22	32	100
15	56	16	28	100	57	21	22	100
19	42	18	40	100	29	18	53	100
20	56	11	33	100	54	13	33	100
21	34	22	44	100	22	10	68	100
22	59	11	30	100	40	18	42	100
23	76	13	11	100	60	23	17	100
27	47	16	37	100	22	27	51	100
30	55	18	27	100	33	27	40	100
33	30	13	57	100	21	7	72	100
36	31	17	52	100	23	13	64	100
38	47	29	24	100	31	34	35	100
39	64	20	16	100	54	25	21	100
40	53	15	32	100	34	24	42	100
Total (Average)	53.05	18.25	28.7	100	45.4	19.1	35.5	100

Note: A=Agree, U= Undecided, D= Disagree

The results of chi-square analysis in Table 4.2 show that P value is above .05%, (x^2=.419, df=1, p≥.05) and there is no significant difference between the two groups' attitudes toward prescriptive model, so null hypothesis is not rejected. According to the percentage agreement of both groups they have similar views in choosing prescriptive model of supervision.

Table 2. The results of Chi-square analysis of the second research question

Level	Total	Prescriptive Model F(%)	Pearson Chi-square	df	Asymp.Sig.
Pre-service	100	53(53.05%)	.653	1	.419[a]
In-service	100	45(45.4%)			

[a] Significant at the 0.05 level

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

4.2 The Difference between Iranian Pre-service and In-service EFL Teachers' Attitudes in Choosing Collaborative Model of Supervision

A chi-square test was conducted for answering the second research question that is to find out the difference between pre-service and in-service EFL teachers toward collaborative supervision model. Table 4.3 shows the results of the agreement and disagreement opinion of both pre-service and in-service teachers concerning the collaborative model. The results reveal that 76.3% of pre-service teachers agree with collaborative model, but only 9.5% of them present their disagreement opinion. Regarding the in-service group, 77.75% of them agree with the model, while 9.25% of them disagree in choosing collaborative model. In better expression, a large percentage of both groups agree in selecting the collaborative model for observing their teaching performance by supervisor and show the same and positive attitudes toward this model.

Table 3. Percentages of pre-service and in-service EFL teachers' attitudes in choosing collaborative supervision model (N=200)

	Pre-service Teachers				In-service Teachers			
Items	A(%)	U(%)	D(%)	Total(%)	A(%)	U(%)	D(%)	Total(%)
3	75	15	10	100	83	11	6	100
4	88	7	5	100	92	3	5	100
6	85	8	7	100	90	5	5	100
8	80	10	10	100	81	14	5	100
10	78	13	9	100	76	15	9	100
12	60	21	19	100	55	25	20	100
14	70	15	15	100	72	15	13	100
16	77	17	6	100	85	7	8	100
17	85	6	9	100	83	4	13	100
18	80	11	9	100	76	15	9	100
24	74	17	9	100	81	12	7	100
25	82	11	7	100	88	6	6	100
26	87	8	5	100	84	11	5	100
28	79	11	10	100	82	9	9	100
29	70	20	10	100	73	17	10	100
31	71	20	9	100	68	20	12	100
32	70	22	8	100	72	15	13	100
34	71	18	11	100	68	20	12	100
35	73	17	10	100	80	11	9	100
37	71	17	12	100	66	25	9	100
Total (Average)	76.3	14.2	9.5	100	77.75	13	9.25	100

Note: A=Agree, U= Undecided, D= Disagree

From Table 4, it can be concluded that the P value of chi-square analysis is above .05%, (x^2= .936, df=1, p≥ .05); therefore, there is no significant difference between the two groups' attitudes toward collaborative supervision model, so the null hypothesis is not rejected. Based on the agreement percentage of both pre-service and in-service teachers, they have the same and positive opinion in using collaborative supervision model.

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

Table 4. The results of Chi-square analysis for the third research question

Level	Total	Collaborative Model F(%)	Pearson Chi-square	df	Asymp.Sig.
Pre-service	100	76(76.3%)	.007	1	.936[a]
In-service	100	77(77.75%)			

[a] Significant at the 0.05 level

4.3. Effect of Gender as a Moderator on the Model of Supervision Preference

To answer the third research question, chi-square analysis was used to perceive the effect of gender as a moderator on the model of supervision preference. Table 4.5 indicate the percentage of agreement of both genders (100 males and 100 females) and chi-square analysis regarding the two prescriptive and collaborative supervision models. The results demonstrate that 50.1% of males and 48.35% of females agree with prescriptive model. This means that almost 50% of both genders agree with this model. Regarding the other model, collaborative, 75.5% of males and 78.55% of females agree with collaborative model. In other words, around more than half of them have the same and positive attitudes toward collaborative model.

Table 5. Frequencies, percentages, and Chi-square analysis of males and females' attitudes in choosing prescriptive and collaborative supervision models (N=200)

Gender	Total	Prescriptive Model F(%)	Total	Collaborative Model F(%)
Male	100	50(50.1%)	100	75(75.5%)
Female	100	48(48.35%)	100	78(78.55%)
Pearson Chi-square		.041		.059
df		1		1
Asymp.Sig.		.840[a]		.808[a]

[a] Significant at the 0.05 level

From Table 5, it can be inferred that the P value of chi-square analysis regarding both genders in choosing prescriptive model is above .05 %, (x^2=.840, df=1, p≥.05), it means that the difference is not significant. In relation to the males and females in choosing collaborative model, the P value of chi-square analysis also is not significant, (x^2=.808, df=1, p≥.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected for the forth research question and gender as a moderator is independent of model of supervision preference.

5. Discussion

This study investigated the difference between attitudes of two groups of teachers (pre-service and in-service) regarding their preference for Prescriptive and Collaborative models of supervision. Concerning the first research question, *"is there any significant difference between Iranian pre-service and in-service EFL teachers in choosing prescriptive model of supervision?"* the results are almost in line with Rashidi and Foroutan (2016) who pointed to the same perception of pre-service and in-service EFL teachers that the current supervising model is more prescriptive.

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

The results are also supported by Aldiahani (2017) who presented the positive teachers' attitude toward prescriptive model, that is being satisfied with this model, but it should be changed in some cases: the supervisors should have friendly interaction between teachers and themselves, should present feedback to guide teachers, an observation program should be done continuously, and supervision should be purposeful to improve the performance of teachers. Therefore, according to the studies cited and the results of the present research, the current supervision model is good, but it is more traditional. So, in order to develop teachers' teaching, the PM should be changed into collaborative model. However, the results differ from those of Rahmany et al. (2014) who indicated that the pre-service and in-service teachers have different attitudes toward prescriptive model. They suggested that the pre-service teachers have positive attitude toward prescriptive model and they use their supervisor's feedback in their teaching, but the in-service teachers have opposite views and act defensively against their directive supervisor's feedback.

Regarding the second research question *"is there any significant difference between Iranian pre-service and in-service EFL teachers in choosing collaborative model of supervision?"* the results are supported by Sharma et al. (2011), Sharma and Al-Sinawaie (2019), Yao Dewodo et al. (2020), Moradi et al. (2014), and Gholaminejad (2020), Estaji and Ghiasvand (2022) which also showed while teachers hold a negative attitude toward prescriptive or directive supervision model, majority of them have positive views toward collaborative model. Because in the collaborative model, the supervisors have constant observation, they have the cooperative and constructive relationship with teachers, supervisors hold post-observation sessions and tend to be objective and unbiased. Also, they employ new techniques in giving feedback and monitoring teachers' teaching and their class. According to these features of collaborative model, large number of both pre-service and in-service teachers have the same opinion and agreement toward the collaborative model. They believe that the collaborative model is an effective and useful model for observation of teachers' teaching and class. However, the results are somewhat in contrary with Aldiahani (2017) who reported the positive attitude toward prescriptive model, but under some conditions: an observation program should be done continuously and supervision should be purposeful to improve the performance of teachers, supervisors should create friendly relationship between the teachers and themselves, and present feedback to guide teachers.

For the last research question which was *"does gender as a moderator significantly affect the model of supervision preference?"* the results are somewhat in line with Sharma and Al-Sinawaie (2019) which indicated that the current supervision is more directive and that they are dissatisfied with it. In sum, gender does not have any relationship with teachers' supervisory beliefs. According to Sharma and Al-Sinawaie (2019) and the results of present study, both genders have the same attitudes toward prescriptive and collaborative models and majority of them have more positive attitudes toward collaborative than prescriptive one.

6. Conclusion, Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

The present study intended to investigate the preference of Iranian pre-service and in-service EFL teachers in both genders regarding prescriptive and collaborative models of supervision. To elicit the attitude of participants regarding the preference for supervision models, the revised model of questionnaire by Rashidi and Foroutan (2016), which was a five-point Likert questionnaire, was answered by the candidates. Regarding the first research question, almost half of the pre-service and in-service teachers were in agreement with and had the same attitude toward the current supervision model (Prescriptive Model), and they believed that this model is good, but some features of it should be changed or modified, features such as "creating friendly relationship between teacher and supervisor", "feedback presentation with soft voice", "consistency of supervision", and "supervision with the purpose of improvement not just evaluation of teachers." Concerning the collaborative model (second research question), almost more than 70% of pre-service and in-service teachers had the same attitude toward collaborative model and they believed that the current supervision model should be changed to the collaborative model. Furthermore, for the last research question, gender did not have any significant effect on the preference for supervision models. In other words, both genders had the same attitude toward prescriptive and collaborative models and most of them were in agreement with the collaborative supervision model.

The findings of the present study showed that the main factor of supervision problem is the type of model by which the supervisors evaluate the teachers' classroom behavior. Following this, in order to improve the instructional plans, teachers' teaching, and also students' learning, training the supervisors in the field of supervision and updating their

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

knowledge is necessary. To prove this issue, the results of questionnaire of this study revealed that the collaborative supervision model is better than the prescriptive model in order to improve the teachers' performance.

Therefore, the findings of current study are important for the supervisors and teacher mentors in order to get familiar with more effective supervision models and also solve the teachers' teaching problems. The present study examined the perceptions of teachers toward supervision via interview individually on the phone, further research can conduct it through face-to-face interview in focus group. Furthermore, this study was done to explore the difference between teachers' attitudes regarding two prescriptive and collaborative supervision models in different contexts, further research can add other models and compare the opinions of the teachers in two formal and informal contexts. Finally, the present study just focused on the effect of gender on the teachers' attitudes in choosing prescriptive and collaborative models, further research can consider the impact of educational degree on teachers' attitudes regarding two mentioned supervisory model.

References

Akpa, G. (1987). Supervision as instrument of teaching and learning effectiveness: The challenges for the Nigerian practice. *Journal of Curriculum Organization of Nigeria, 2*(4), 32-37. file:///C:/Users/SMA/Downloads/ajol-file-journals_189_articles_53763_submission_proof_53763-2245-85848-1-10-20100416.pdf

Aldiahani, S. (2017). Effect of prevalent supervisory styles on teaching performance in Kuwaiti high schools. *Asian Social Science, 13*(4), 25-36. doi:10.5539/ass.v13n4p25

Behlol, M., Yousuf, M., Parveen, Q., & Kayani, M. (2011). Concept of supervision and supervisory practices of primary level in Pakistan. *International Education Studies, 4*(4), 28-35. doi:10.5539/ies.v4n4p28

Bolin, F., & Panaritis, P. (1992). Searching for a common purpose: A perspective on the history of supervision. In C.D.Glickman(ed.), *Supervision in transition* (pp. 30-43). Alexandria,VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cogan, M. (1973). *Clinical supervision.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Drummer, J., Hakimov, G., Joldoshov, M., Kohler, T., & Udartseva, S. (2018). *Vocational teacher education in central Asia developing skills and facilitating success.* https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-319-73093-6

Estaji, M., & Ghiasvand, F. (2022). Classroom supervision and professionalism: Matches and mismatches in the perceptions of novice and experienced teachers. *Applied Research on English Language, 11*(3), 1-36. doi:10.22108/ARE.2022.131707.1817

Firth, G., & Eiken, K. (1982). Impact of the schools' bureaucratic structure on supervision. In T.J.Sergiovanni(Ed.), *Supervision of teaching* (pp. 153-169). Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Freeman, D. (1982). Observing teachers: Three approaches to in-service training and developement. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(1), 21-29. doi:10.2307/3586560

Gebhard, J. (1984). Models of supervision: Choices. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(3), 501-514. doi:10.2307/3586717

Gholaminejad, R. (2020). When the evil pops in: Exploring the unheard voices of teachers working in private language schools in Iran concerning the supervisory observation. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1-24. doi:10.1080/13603124.2020.1740795

Glanz, J. (1998). Histories, antecedents, and legacies of school supervision. In G. R. Firth, & E. F . Pajak(Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 39-79). New York: Macmillan.

Glickman, C. (1981). *Developmental supervision.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2004). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach (6thed.).* New York: Pearson Education Inc.

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methodes for the supervision of teachers* . New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Wiston.

Goldsberry, L. (1988). Three functional methods of supervision. *Action in Teacher Education, 10*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.1988.10519369

Grimsley, E., & Bruce, R. (1982). *Reading in educational supervision from "Educational Leadership"(ed.).* Alexandria,VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gursoy, E., Kenser, J., & Salihoglu, U. (2016). Clinical supervision model in teaching practice: Does it make a difference in supervisors performance? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(11), 61-76. doi:10.14221/ajte.2016v41n11.5

Ibara, E. (2013). Exploring clinical supervision as instrument for effective teacher supervision. *Africa Education Review, 10*(2), 238-252. doi:10.1080/18146627.2013.812283

Jeffery, G. (1994). History of educational supervision: Proposals and prospects. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision(COPIS).* Chicago,IL.

Kaso, N., Mariani, M., Ilham, D., Firman, F., Aswar, N., & Iksan, M. (2021). The principal's leadership: How to improve the quality of teaching and learning process in state junior high school of Luwa. *Journal Ad'ministrare, 8*(1), 49. doi:10.26858/ja.v8i1.19126

Kayaoglu, M. (2012). Dictating or facilitating: The supervisory process for language teachers. *Australian Journal of Teachers Education, 37*(10), 103-117. doi:10.14221/ajte.2012v37n10.4

Kovacevic, J., & Hallinger, P. (2019). Leading school change and improvement: A bibliometric analysis of the knowledge base (1960-2017). *Journal of Educational Administration, 57*(6), 635-657. doi:10.1108/JEA-02-2019-0018

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational leadership. *Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Resrearch Association.* Boston.

Lorensius, W. W., Silpanus, S., & Ping, T. (2021). Leadership model and planning strategies in private Catholic colleges during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Studies in Social Sciences (IJESSS), 1*(2), 49-60. doi :10.53402/ijesss.v1i2.16

Mbonu, F. (2004). Techniques of supervision. In M. Anuna(ed.), *Educational supervision: The Nigerian experience.* Owerri, Nigeria: International Universities Press Ltd.

Mette, I., Range, B., Anderson, J., Hvidston, D., Nieuwenhuizen, L., & Doty, J. (2017). The wicked problem of the intersection between supervision and evaluation. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 9*(3), 709-724. https://www.iejee.com/index.php/IEJEE/article/view/185

Moradi, K., Sepehrifar, S., & Khadive, T. (2014). Exploring Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions on supervision. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 1214-1223. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.536

Mustaghfiroh, M., Ariyanti, N., Adha, M., & Sultoni, S. (2020). Upaya peningkatan komitmen kerja guru bidang studi (studi kasus di SMK riyadlul guran kabupaten malang). *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen Pendidikan, 5*(1), 22-28. doi:10.26740/jdmp.v5n1.p22-28

Muttaqin, I. (2020). Supervision planing at Islamic education institutions: Google scholar library studies and Mendeley's reference manager. *Istawa: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 5*(2), 222. doi:10.24269/ijpi.v5i2.2847

Pajak, E. (2000). *Approaches to clinical supervision: Alternatives for improving instruction.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Rahmany, R., Hassani, M., & Parhoodeh, K. (2014). EFL teachers' attitudes toward being supervised in an EFL context. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5*(2), 348-359. doi:10.4304/jltr.5.2.348-359

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

Rashidi, N., & Foroutan, A. (2016). On the Iranian in-service and pre-service language teachers' perceptions of educational supervision concerning their professional developement. *Issue in Language Teaching (ILT), 4*(2), 27-55. doi:10.22054/ILT.2015.7225

Sharma, S., & Al-Sinawai, S. (2019). Attitudinal differences towards instructional supervision: A study of teacher beliefs and supervisory behavior in Malaysia. *International Education Studies, 12*(8), 106-115. doi:10.5539/ies.v12n8p106

Sharma, S., Yusoff, M., Kannan, S., & Binti Baba, S. (2011). Concerns of teachers and principals on instructional supervision in three Asian countries. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Hummanity, 1*(3), 214-217. doi:10.7763/IJSSH.2011.V1.37

Sollivan, S., & Glanz.J. (2000). Alternative approaches to supervision: Cases from the field. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 15*(3), 212-235.

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). *Supervision that improves teachings, sterategies and techniques.* California: Corwin Press Inc.

Thomas, T. (2008). Fixing teacher education. *Journal of Educational Leadership, 66*(2), 32-37.

Veloo, A. A., Kamuji, M., & Khalid, R. (2013). The effect of clinical supervision on the teaching performance of secondary school teachers. *Procedia-Social and Bihavioral Sciences, 93*, 35-39. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.148

Viriyapanyanont, T., Kewara, P., & Prabjandee, D. (2019). Teacher supervision program to enhance teacher's learning to teach glocal English. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 6*(2), 133-142. doi:10.30845/ijll.V6n2p17

Wallace, M. (1989). *Clinical supervision and school experience.* Mimeo Sceo Moray House College: Edinburgh.

Yao Dewodo, C., Dzakpasu, P., & Agbetorwoka, A. (2020). Perception of teachers on instructional supervision at basic schools in Hoboe Municipality of Ghana. *American Journal of Education and Information Technology, 4*(1), 33-40. doi:10.11648/j.ajeit.20200401.15

Zepeda, S. (2007). Cognitive dissonance, supervision, and administrative team conflict. *International Journal of Educational Management, 20*(3), 224-232. doi:10.1108/09513540610654191

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

Appendix

Teacher Supervision Questionnaire

Direction: This study intends to investigate the perceptions of English language teachers regarding teacher supervision. You have to complete two sections. The first section is related to your demographic information, and in the second section, for each question, you have to select one of the items of questionnaire which is based on the five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Please read and answer the items carefully. Your answers will be kept confidential. Thank you for your time allocation and kind cooperation.

Part A: Demographic Information

Name:

Age:

Gender: Female Male

Academic degree: B.A M.A Ph.D …

Field of study: English literature English translation TEFL …

Year(s) of teaching experience: ……

Teaching context: Public schools Private institutes Both …

Part B: Teacher Supervision Questionnaire

Items of Questionnaire	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Any supervising system for teachers' classroom performance must have within itself all types of known classroom behavior.					
۲. Any teacher supervision model must be in the form of predetermined hierarchical reporting relationship with already specified criteria.					
3. Any teacher supervision model must be based on trust relationship between teacher and supervisor.					
4.The supervisor must let teachers freely talk about their clinical work concerns.					
5. Any teacher supervision model must provide for meeting organizational expectations.					
6. Any teacher supervisory procedure must aim at empowering teachers through guided reflection (reflecting to guide the teachers in implementing positive classroom behaviors).					
7. Any teacher supervision model must be under the control and leadership of the school principal.					

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

8. The main purpose of any supervision model is facilitating the teachers' classroom behaviors through the teachers' reflection on their classroom behaviors.	
9. The supervisor must have enough power and authority so that the teachers apply his/her feedback in their teaching methods.	
10. Any teacher supervision model is constructive in case it does not sacrifice ethical and interactive considerations between the teacher and supervisor to the expected organizational instructions.	
11. A constructive supervision model puts emphasis on evaluation of teachers as a key component.	
12. Any positive and effective supervision model focuses on the teachers' professional and individual development rather than modifying overall classroom interactions.	
13. The basis of an effective and positive supervision model is the supervisor's judgement about teachers' classroom interactions.	
14.Teachers must have enough authority to be able to personally choose their model of classroom supervision.	
15. Successful supervisors monitor the classroom practice of teachers according to predetermined standard checklists.	
16. A constructive model of supervision gives priority to teachers' learning needs.	
17. Any leading supervisor must constantly provide teachers with objective feedback.	
18. The teacher classroom supervisor must diagnose and solve teachers' instructional problems instead of evaluating and judging teachers.	
19. The classroom supervisor must act as an administrator in choosing the positive and effective classroom practices and prescribing them directively to the teachers' classroom behaviors.	

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

20. Supervision is effective and constructive when the supervisor observes the teachers according to a formal and predetermined checklist.	
21. A successful supervisor directively controls and manages teachers' instructional method.	
22. Teachers' classroom supervision must take place accidentally without any prior planning.	
23. A constructive supervision model grants the supervisor enough authority to modify some of the teachers' teaching behaviors as needed, in an awareness-raising manner.	
24. The main focus of any positive and constructive supervision model must be on improving a positive attitude towards eliminating inefficient classroom interactions.	
25. The prime responsibility of any supervisor is creating a trust relationship with the observed teachers.	
26. A constructive supervisory model must be focused on contributing to teachers' professional development than evaluating and judging them.	
27. All the teachers' classroom practices and interactions must be assessed and judged by the supervisor and the supervisor must approve them.	
28. The supervisor must act as a facilitator who helps the teachers to develop autonomy.	
29. A supervision model must help to reduce the power distance between supervisor and teacher.	
30. The positive and constructive supervision models convey this message to the teachers that supervisors are an informative source of knowledge on positive practices and interactions.	
31. The main focus of a positive and constructive supervision model is to prioritize constructive dialogues on classroom practices between the teacher and supervisor rather than evaluating teacher based on existing supervisory checklists.	
32. A constructive supervision model more focuses on shared responsibility between the	

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]

teacher and supervisor rather than criticizing the teachers' classroom practices based on predetermined criteria.	
33. The supervisor's responsibility is to give evaluative and directive feedback to the teacher at the end of supervising session.	
34. In a constructive supervision model, discovery of teachers' strengths and weaknesses is preferred over the supervisor's judgmental assessment and evaluation.	
35. Suggestive feedback is preferred over directive one in successful supervisory models.	
36. The supervisor must just try to modify wrong aspects of teachers' classroom practice.	
37. Supervisor must focus on collaboration and assistance than giving feedback on teacher's negative classroom practices.	
38. Teachers must follow supervisor's direction instead of remaining defensive against his/her judgement.	
39. Judgement and evaluation in teacher supervision will result in speeding the pace of improvement and development.	
40. A supervisor must keep personal distance with the teachers and not be too friendly with them so that they follow his/her prescribed instructions.	

[Downloaded from mail.ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-19]