



Gonbad Kavous University

Resistance in Language Teacher Supervision in Iran: Identifying the Sources and Developing Strategies to Manage the Mess



Linguistics Society of Iran

¹Hessam Agheshteh*  ²Somaye Saeedi 

ABSTRACT

Language teacher supervision, which is mainly characterized by power asymmetry and imbalance, is a highly complex process that involves a number of potentially huge challenges, one of which is the English language teachers' resistance and even reluctance to change their teaching behavior as instructed and required by the language teacher supervisors. Drawing on Foucault's (1990) concept of power and resistance and Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivism, the present study made an attempt to identify the principal sources of this potential resistance and reluctance to change in the Iranian EFL supervision context and develop some coherent strategies to tactfully manage the problem at hand. The qualitative data which were obtained from semi-structured interviews were rigorously analyzed by using constant comparative analysis. The themes which were developed as the main sources of teacher resistance and reluctance to change included the following: (1) language teacher supervisors' top-down views, (2) language teachers' and supervisors' conflicting beliefs on learning and teaching (3) classroom dynamics, and (4) contextual variability. The themes that were developed as possible strategies to successfully manage the problem were (1) supervisors' acceptance of healthy resistance, (2) adopting a dialogic approach, (3) considering contextual variability, (4) using above-the-utterance-level mitigation, and (5) developing public relations skills.

Article History

Received:

2024-02-08

Revised:

2024-04-26

Accepted:

2024-06-01

Published:

2024-07-01

Key Word

Power
Asymmetry,
Power Imbalance,
Social
Constructivism,
Teacher
Resistance and
Teacher
Supervision

1. Corresponding Author: Assistant professor, Azadshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Azadshahr, Iran- Email: agheshteh@gmail.com

ORCID ID:

2. English Department, Gonbad Kavous Branch, Islamic Azad University, Gonbad Kavous, Iran - Email: s.saeediii31@gmail.com ORCID ID:

Article Citation: Agheshteh, H., & Saeedi, S. (2024). Resistance in language teacher supervision in Iran: Identifying the sources and developing strategies to manage the mess. *Journal of Critical Applied Linguistics Studies*, 1(2), 193-208.

1. Introduction

A significant component of any language teacher education program is teacher supervision which is often replete with enormous challenges, one of which is the teachers' resistance and reluctance to change as instructed by the language teacher supervisors (Bailey, 2006). Supervision entails undertaking many unpleasant responsibilities including providing teachers with critical feedback, making sure teachers stick to program policies, and even firing teachers if the need to do so arises. When fulfilling their responsibilities, the supervisors may either consciously or subconsciously abuse

The power assigned to them by the relevant organizations and the teachers may also either overtly or covertly resist the supervisors trying to protect their own autonomy and agency (Agheshteh & Mehrpour, 2021). This clearly indicates a certain level of tension between the two parties, which, if not managed carefully, can seriously hinder EFL/ESL teachers' development intended by the supervision job.

Foucault's (1991) conception of power, "where there is power, there is resistance" (1990, p. 95), has serious implications for language teacher supervision profession here because it, first of all, implies that the teacher is not a completely powerless social being but is an active agent who exerts his own power either overtly or covertly resisting the required change if not mutually negotiated as proposed by social constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978), and, second, this new conception of power represents a break from more traditional notions of power as an inhibiting, coercive and oppressive force to more modern notions of power as something constitutive, productive and, as asserted by Monchinski (2008) in critical pedagogy, even necessary for the humanization of education. So according to Foucault, there is power everywhere and it is moving in all directions. This power is fluid and it is not permanently held by some groups or individuals. Power is, in fact, always operating in a changing and unstable manner based on the social forces present in the context. Social interactions including post-observation conferences (POCs) in language teacher supervision can be seen as sites of struggle and conflict where power and resistance prevail (Burr, 2003).

Very few studies have so far investigated teacher resistance in language teacher supervision in Iran. Since teacher resistance can seriously affect the teachers' professional development if not meticulously dealt with, this study attempted to address this issue to identify its sources and develop strategies to manage it.

2. Literature Review

Language teacher supervision theories, according to Wallace (1991), can be classified into two broad categories – the prescriptive approaches and the collaborative ones. In the former, the supervisor

Believed to be an authority who judges the supervisees' teaching skills, while in the latter, the supervisor is considered as the teachers' colleague who attentively listens and tries to help the teacher

develop autonomy. Wallace (1991) also contends that we should strive for a more collaborative approach for both affective and cognitive reasons and this is the case in North American contexts as Bailey (2006) asserts. In Iran, however, supervisors, as indicated by Agheshteh and Mehrpour (2021), mostly employ classic prescriptive approaches to supervision where teachers have little power to make decisions, which seems to have led to resistance on the part of the teachers.

The supervisors who use classic prescriptive approaches will grant teachers very little power totally ignoring their autonomy and dictating them all classroom practices. Consequently, the feedback the teachers get will be completely prescriptive and directive in nature with the teachers having little power to make their own decisions. But the more the supervisors move towards classic collaborative approaches, the more dialogic, reflective, collaborative and democratic the feedback will be. Here, teachers will have their own say during the post-observation conference with the supervisors eager to share their power to make mutual and agreed-upon decisions in the classroom.

Recently the directive and prescriptive approach to supervision has been vigorously challenged by social constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978) which, as stressed by Herschensohn and Young Scholten (2013) gives a substantially significant role to the social actors in their construction of reality and of world knowledge. Drawing on Vygotsky's (1987) social constructivism and Foucault's (1991) conception of power, Copeland et. al. (2011) investigated power dynamics in clinical supervision challenging the traditional approach to supervision where the supervisor is seen as an expert that exercises a substantial amount of power and influence. They presented a supervision model in which multiple possibilities are promoted, meaning is co-constructed through dialogue, and the relationship is collaborative rather than hierarchical. This study that clearly indicates the move from tradition and modernism to postmodern social constructivism strongly emphasizes dialog where supervisees can effectively negotiate and co-construct their own world of meaning and knowledge because social constructivists, as stressed by Myles (2013), severely criticize the traditional views where communication is seen as the transmission of predetermined meanings.

Discussing the implications of social constructivism and its key concepts especially Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) for language teacher supervision, Bailey (2006) quotes van Lier asking teachers how they ensure their teaching practices meet their students' ZPD. The answer for researchers working in the Vygotskian mold, he believes, is social interaction, because the mutual engagement and the intersubjectivity therein is most likely to home in on the students' ZPD. The same fact, as Bailey (2006) argues, holds for language teacher supervisors who, using mutual engagement and collaboration, need to meet the teachers' ZPD to better promote self-regulated action.

Bedford and Gehlert (2013) also propose a model in clinical supervision which is closely related to the social constructivists' ZPD or the supervisees' readiness level as they call it, where job readiness refers to the supervisees' ability to change and psychological readiness refers to their

willingness to change (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). The model requires the supervisor to move between prescriptive/directive and collaborative/reflective models of supervision based on the supervisees' readiness levels. Drawing on the model, Bailey (2006) defines the roles the language teacher supervisors can assume, where how much directive the supervisors decides to be is decided on by their task behavior, and the amount of close rapport the supervisors decide to engage in is determined by their relationship behavior (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2001).

Highlighting the collaborative nature of supervision where the supervisors and supervisees share their power, Copeland, Dean and Wladkowski (2011, p. 28) also assert that supervision based on the postmodern social constructivism "promotes multiple possibilities, an emphasis on meaning that is co-constructed through dialogue, and a view of the supervisory relationship as collaborative rather than hierarchical," because social constructivists, according to Herschensohn and Young-Scholten (2013), give a major role to the social actors in the co-construction of meaning.

In Iran, to our best knowledge, very few studies have addressed language teacher supervision in general and language teacher resistance in particular, and it seems it is the first of its kind to tackle the issue as far as the Iranian context and culture is concerned. One study with some implications for power dynamics in language teacher supervision in Iran was conducted by Agheshteh and Mehrpour (2021). Analysis of the interviews and post-observation feedback conferences confirmed that supervisors mostly used classic prescriptive approaches to supervision in which teachers have little power. Supervisors mostly resorted to their position and reward power seldom using their expert power which seems to have led to resistance on the part of the teachers. So the present study seeks to address this existing gap in the literature by identifying the sources of teacher resistance and developing effective strategies to manage it.

3. Method

Participants

The participants of the study, selected with data saturation in mind, consisted of 8 individual teachers and two focus groups each with 4 teachers, i.e. a total of 16 teachers, 8 of whom were male and the other 8 female, all aged between 30 and 45. One teacher held a PhD in TEFL/TESL, 5 teachers an M.A. in TEFL/TESL, 2 teachers an M.A. in translation studies, 4 teachers a B.A. in English literature, 2 teachers a B.A. in translation studies and 2 teachers a B.A. in teaching. The teachers, all selected through convenient sampling, came from the Iran Language Institute, Nashre Zaban Institute, and Sama Language Center in Gorgan and Gonbad. Convenient sampling, a sampling technique which qualitative researchers employ to select participants that are easily accessible, was used because of the reluctance of some teachers to participate in the study because of privacy issues and the possible FTAs involved.

Instrument

The instruments used for data collection were semi-structured interviews and focus groups. Potter (1996) argues that interviews are valuable tools for collecting data in qualitative research because they allow the researchers to deeply interact with the participants and to also observe the non-verbal cues during the interview process. Creswell (2009) points out the importance of focus groups, which allows a number of participants to be interviewed at once. Clarke (1999) suggests focus groups work well because “group members influence each other with their comments, and participants may form opinions after considering the views of others. Tapping into this interpersonal dialogue can help identify common experience and shared concerns” (p. 395). With these in mind, the researchers comprehensively reviewed the literature, and developed six questions for their interviews and focus groups. They, then, had the questions reviewed and evaluated by another expert teacher in the area and the issues were put into negotiation.

Data Collection Procedure

Briefing the participants on the procedures for carrying out interviews and focus groups, the researchers interviewed 8 individual teachers and 2 focus groups each with four teachers at a specific time and location already set by the participants in the study. Whenever the teachers were available, face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted (6 teachers) and whenever they were not available, the interviews were conducted on telephone (2 teachers). Focus group interviews were both conducted face to face. The interviews were recorded with permission and strict anonymity and confidentiality guaranteed. Then the interviews were transcribed and were put to analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using Ary, Jacobs and Sorensen's (2010) three-step approach which consists of organizing and familiarizing, coding and reducing and finally interpreting and representing. The data, organized and transcribed based on the answers the participants gave to each of the questions, were read and reread and repeatedly listened to so that the researchers could familiarize themselves with the data. The researchers, then, started to code and reduce the data by Corbin and Strauss's (2008) systematic approach where the constant comparative method is the major technique of analysis. With open coding, the first researcher came up with some tentative categories, which were examined, using axial coding, for the possible relationships to see whether they might be put into larger categories. Finally, with selective coding, one category was selected as the main category i.e. the theme.

The researchers ensured the credibility of the findings using ‘respondent validation’ or ‘member checks’ (Ary, et al., 2010), where the researchers return the data and the findings to the participants and informants to be critically reviewed and check for accuracy. Having written the findings in the form of comments at the margins, the researchers sent them to the same informants to see whether they agreed with the codes identified or not. In case there were inconsistencies, they were all put to

negotiation. Where the informants were not available, the researchers used 'peer review', giving the colleagues the raw data along with interpretations. Discussing the interpretations with the colleagues, the researchers made the necessary changes where the colleagues considered the interpretations made by the researchers to be unreasonable. Inter-coder agreement was calculated using "Reliability=No. of agreements/total number of agreements + disagreements*100" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 64), which yielded an index 80.35 %.

4. Results

The findings of the study are presented in two separate parts, where the first part presents the themes developed as sources of teacher resistance in the Iranian EFL context and the second part the themes developed to manage it.

Sources of teacher resistance

The results indicated that the sources of teacher resistance include (1) language teacher supervisors' top-down views, (2) supervisors' and teachers' conflicting beliefs, (3) classroom dynamics and (4) contextual variability.

Top-down Views

A theme which was frequently mentioned by the teachers as the main source of their resistance was the fact that the observers had mostly top-down views and frequently dictated their own teaching approaches and methods ignoring those of the teachers. A teacher [T2] succinctly said

Observers see themselves superior and try to impose their own teaching method and style.

Sometimes the institutes themselves have a top-down view of the teaching and the supervision process rigidly prescribing particular teaching principles and techniques. A teacher [T8] explained

... for example, Kanoon Zaban ... the way they treat their teachers ... even if the teachers are reluctant, they have to adhere ... because if they do not, they won't get a raise and financially they will end up with some loss.

Conflicting Beliefs

The next recurring theme was the difference between teachers' and supervisors' teaching/learning beliefs. They stated that teachers sometimes do not implement the observers' recommendations because they don't comply with their own teaching/learning beliefs which results in teachers' tendency to resist the observers and exercise their own agency. A teacher [T1] said

I believe what the observers suggest is filtered by the teachers' own beliefs and attitudes.

Another teacher [T7] added

Unless the observers negotiate for agreed-upon solutions, the teachers will go on with their own method.

Classroom Dynamics

Classroom dynamics can also prevent teachers from fully implementing the supervisors' recommendations. For example, teachers in some classes might face some unexpected questions on the part of their students and might run short of time to strictly follow the prescriptions. Still some other classes might be more crowded, less competent, more mixed, less disciplined and well-behaved and much noisier. A teacher [T7] commented

Well ... imagine a class which is lazier or ... I don't know more or less crowded ... or let's say ... a teacher is pressed for time ... you see all these affect the teachers' implementing the supervisors' recommendations.

Contextual Variability

Sociocultural factors including the teachers' age, sex, experience, knowledge, education, and degree can create resistance too. A teacher said [T5]

Well, a supervisor cannot treat a teacher with ten to twenty years of experience like a beginner.

Another teacher [T6] added

Teachers' degree is also important. A teacher with PhD should be treated differently. If not, he will certainly resist the comments. Even males and females should be treated differently.

Themes Developed to Manage Teacher Resistance

The findings indicated that supervisors can follow the themes below to alleviate teacher resistance in language teacher supervision in Iran.

Accept Healthy Resistance

One of the frequent themes was the fact that some resistance is natural and even positive because teachers themselves have some experience and knowledge based on which they tend to exert their own autonomy. They stated this autonomy, which might be manifested in the form of resistance, must be taken into account and the teachers' creativity must be respected. The following are quotes from the teachers. A teacher [T1] said:

I believe it is neither negative nor something harmful. I believe sometimes it can be even positive. In this way observers can learn themselves, too. If challenged by teachers, they will have to think and reflect more on their observing practice and they will grow.

Another teacher [T5] believed that

Teachers are active agents and not passive ones. Supervisors should respect this agency even if it creates resistance. Maybe these teachers are right in that context.

Adapt a Dialogic Approach

A theme frequently mentioned by the teachers was their widespread dissatisfaction with the current supervisory approach, which was more directive than collaborative and more supervisor-centered than teacher-centered. Teachers believed that the observers could be more flexible negotiating their recommendations with the teachers to reach agreed-upon solutions. The following quotes from the participants represent such an attitude. A teacher [T2] noted:

Well, supervision should not be one-way ... it should be ... actually two-way ... with the teacher allowed to speak too.

Another teacher [T5] noted

Definitely, supervisors should respect teachers' creativity and if there is a problem, they should negotiate it with the teacher. They should not try to impose their own ideas.

Consider Contextual Variability

The next frequent theme was the fact that supervisors need to consider both the context of situation and the larger context of social culture. That is, supervisors should take into consideration the

classroom dynamics, teachers' knowledge, education, experience, age, degree, sex and cultural background. A teacher [T1] explained

First of all, they should respect teachers in terms of their experience, knowledge, education, degree, age and even sex.

Another teacher [T4] believed that:

Factors like age, sex, education ... social and cultural background ... and a lot of other social, cultural and educational factors should be considered.

Use Above- the- utterance-level Mitigation

The next frequent theme mentioned by the teachers was the discourse used by supervisors to give feedback. They believed that supervisors should first highlight the teachers' strengths hedging their criticism when discussing their weaknesses. A [T5] noted

They can soften their tone of criticism and respect teachers' point of views. This can lead to mutual respect between the observer and the teachers. They can also ask teachers why they used some techniques in their class to give a good justification for what they do.

Develop Interpersonal skills

Another theme mentioned by the teachers was that the supervisors should be able to develop public relations skills establishing a warm and close rapport with the supervisors which can set the scene for the forthcoming criticism and better convince them to incorporate the recommendations. A teacher [T2] said

The first and most important thing is to have a good relationship with the teacher and to pay attention to him/her and his/her ideas.

Another teacher [T6] also noted

Yes ... yes ... anyway the relationship should be mutual and friendly ...not observer comes and observe and point out some cases and go ... the teacher also has his/her own reason why s/he does not apply these cases ...depending on the city ... depending on the learners of there, we should not have one ...for example, consider a place like Tehran ...the observers who goes there and observe comes here ...all, for example, apply a series of procedures here ... observe, write and go ... I do not think so much that it is useful to advance their goals in the future.

5. Discussion

Teacher resistance in language teacher supervision in the Iranian EFL context seems to have originated from different sources, of which, supervisors' top down views, which belong to Wallace's (1991) classic prescriptive approaches to language teacher supervision where teachers have no power, are in line with Bailey's (2006) assertion that language teacher supervision has been traditionally directive and prescriptive though, as Bailey (2006) further asserts, the general trend in the North-American context has been moving toward more collaborative and reflective approaches. However, this does not at all seem to be the case with the Iranian EFL context, where, as found by Agheshteh's (2019) and Agheshteh and Mehrpour (2021), language teacher supervision in Iran still tends to be directive and prescriptive, which, as indicated by the findings of the present study, can create a substantial amount of resistance because, as Foucault (1991) succinctly states, wherever we have power, we have resistance. So, it seems the supervisors in Iran, in line with the implications of social constructivism (Herschensien & Young-Scholten, 2013) which ask for dialogic interactions, need to go from more prescriptive to more collaborative approaches where they share their power with teachers negotiating for agreed-upon solutions to somewhat alleviate "the tug-of-war" (Bailey, 2006, p. xiii) going on between teachers and supervisors.

Supervisors' and teachers' conflicting beliefs, as the next most significant source of resistance, highlight the stakeholders' attitudes, values, perspectives, opinions, perceptions, conceptions, ideologies, implicit theories and explicit theories (Pajares, 1992), which can heavily affect both the supervisors' and the teachers' meaning making and decision making (Valcke). Both supervisors and teachers come into class with powerful, and as found by the present study, conflicting beliefs on what teaching is, what learning is and even what supervising is, which has led to a considerable amount of resistance in language teacher supervision in Iran. As suggested by Richardson (2001), beliefs must be attended, without which, transformational changes in teaching practice will not occur. This also supports the finding by Agheshteh and Mehrpour (2017), who argue that assessing the teachers' beliefs and attitudes constitutes one of the most important elements of effective supervisory feedback. So, as Richardson (2001) further argues, the stakeholders must be encouraged to form beliefs which are evidence-based and must be ready to alter their beliefs in case they don't comply with findings in the ESL domain. This can substantially decrease the tension between supervisors and teachers leading to better professional development on both parts.

Classroom dynamics, as another source of teacher resistance, refers to the particularity of each classroom context Kumaravadivelu (2006) where the teacher is required to be context-sensitive, spontaneous, innovative and autonomous because the class might be different in terms of students' proficiency level, learning styles, attitudes, age, sex and even class size, the fact which brings

resistance with supervisors striving for uniformity and consistency of teaching regardless of the hard facts of the classroom (Agheshteh & Mehrpour). Teachers sometimes do things in class that are not directly related to learning English, but rather are focused on the social aspects of the group and happen “in the moment” (Underhill, 1999, p. 130), a fact which can affect the teachers’ implementing the supervisors’ recommendations.

Contextual variability is the final source of teacher resistance. Contextual variability or cultural difference typically used to describe physical characteristics and socially transmitted behavioral patterns, beliefs, and values that distinguish one group of people from another (Pope-Davis & Coleman, 1997). Cultural differences manifest through the expression of several characteristics (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, age, religion, nationality, physical ability) that define individual identity and contribute to one's life story (Robinson & Howard-Hamilton, 2000). The awareness of racial or cultural difference results in a sense of anxiety from feeling uneasy, tense, worried, or apprehensive about what might occur during the interaction (Gudykunst, 2005).

Accepting healthy resistance is in line with what (Smale, 1998) points as resisters often criticized and perceived as disruptive to the change process, can also be valuable. It is important to hear what the resisters have to say, as their resistance might be well founded and their feedback useful. The resistor may have good reasons not to move forward with the change, and recognizing those objections and solving the problems they bring up might improve the effectiveness of the process and practice. Conveying respect for and seeking out the resistor’s opinion is certainly a good engagement strategy but can also be a way to get information critical to successful implementation. This aligned with Mansouri’s (2021) findings which revealed that each teacher took different approaches in positioning the various characters in their storylines. The result of analyzing reflective journals, classroom observation and semi-structured interviews conducted by Sardabi, Biria and Ameri (2018) over a semester revealed that the participating teachers moved from compliance to resistance of the existing policies. English language teaching (ELT) setting in Iran where a juxtaposition of overt (e.g. in textbooks) and covert (e.g. native speakerism) ELT policies put teachers in a state of iterative identity construction processes accompanied by conflicts and tensions (Mirhosseini et al. 2021; Mirzaee & Aliakbari, 2018).

The themes developed from the interviews clearly indicated that power, as stressed by Foucault (1991), is not always negative which is always used for suppression and oppression. The finding of the research present that some resistance is healthy is in line with Foucault’s new conceptions of power that it is sometimes positive. This implies that even if teachers exert their own power, it should not be considered as something which is always negative.

One more study on language teacher supervision conducted by Mehrpour and Agheshteh (2017) who report on the views of Iranian EFL teachers and supervisors as to what constitutes effective supervisory feedback present a framework which includes 1 -adopting a more creative approach 2-

using above-the-utterance mitigation 3- gauging the teacher's ZPD 4- being socioculturally sensitive 5- assessing teachers' beliefs and attitudes and 6- developing public relations. The results showed the teachers' overall dissatisfaction with the present supervisory feedback. The paper concludes by suggestions to include supervisory training course in the existing teacher development programs to better empower supervisors in their dealing with EFL supervisees throughout the country.

Teachers' asking for more dialogic approaches to supervision is also in line with Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivism which calls for dialogic interactions so the knowledge can be co-constructed by both sides i.e. the teacher and the supervisor. This is also in line with Wallace's classic collaborative approach. As argued by Bailey (2006, 2009), supervision in North American contexts is moving towards more collaborative and dialogic approaches. Iranian teachers also wish the supervisors to employ more collaborative and reflective approaches. This supports Agheshteh and Mehrpour's (2021) findings, who argued for two-way relationship in the process of supervision.

As van Lier (1996, p. 191) contends, researchers working in the Vygotskian mould believe "that social interaction, by virtue of its orientation toward mutual engagement and intersubjectivity, is likely to home in on the ZPD and stay within it." This is in line with Bedford and Gehlert's (2013) situational supervision where supervisors are expected to change roles based on the supervisees' readiness level. This readiness level or development level which is closely related to the concept of ZPD can be diagnosed best if supervisors employ a dialogic approach where the evolving interactions between the supervisor and the supervisee can help the supervisors' gauge the teachers' readiness level or ZPD (Muse-Burke et al., 2001). Meeting teachers' ZPD, as indicated by Mehrpour and Agheshteh (2017), is one of the constituent elements of effective supervisory feedback, too.

Considering contextual variability is also in line with Razmjoo and Rasti's (2014) and Mehrpour and Agheshteh's (2017) findings, according to which, the immediate culture of the classroom and the larger social context in which supervision takes place plays a key role. Further Agheshteh and Mehrpour (2021) argue teachers frequently preferred sociocultural factors including their "cultural background", "education", "degree", "experience", "age", and "sex" to be taken into consideration when they were being observed.

This is because, as Bailey (2006, p.6) says, a supervisor's role is to some extent "culturally defined", and depending on the social, cultural, educational, and political context they are working in, supervisors will need to vary their supervisory styles moving between prescriptive and collaborative approaches. This will provide supervisees with a more supportive environment (Green & Dekkers, 2010) and will lead to more supervisee satisfaction (Inman, 2006; Murphy & Wright, 2005).

Using above-the-utterance-level mitigation, according to which, we prepare the teacher for the forthcoming criticism by both highlighting the strengths and mitigating the negative feedback is in

line with Wajnryb's (1994) finding, according to which, above-the-utterance-level mitigation can protect teachers' face thereby helping them to accept feedback more easily. This supports Agheshteh's (2019) findings, according to which the negative feedback is neither too soft at the expense of clarity (hypermitigation), nor too direct that might offend the supervisees (hypomitigation). It also gives support to Mehrpour and Agheshteh's (2017) finding, according to which, above-the-utterance-level mitigation was one of the essential components of effective supervisory feedback.

Finally, developing public relation skills or what Shulman (1993) refers to it a "working relationship" and Kaiser (1997) the "supervisory relationship" give support to the findings of Razmjoo and Rasti (2014) and Mehrpour and Agheshteh (2017) who argued for supervisors' establishing a close and friendly rapport with the teachers which are supervised.

6. Conclusion

The present study tried to develop a framework to manage teacher resistance to language teacher supervision. It seems that many English language teacher supervisors limit their choice of supervisory behaviors and models. The themes that were based on one-on-one semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews and questionnaires, answered two research questions and yielded a framework to manage teacher resistance to language teacher supervision. The themes developed as the sources of teacher resistance were (1) language teacher supervisors' top-down views, (2) conflicting beliefs (3) Classroom dynamics, and (4) contextual variability. The themes developed to manage teacher resistance were (1) supervisors' acceptance of healthy resistance, (2) adopting a dialogic approach to supervision, (3) considering contextual variability, (4) using above-the-utterance-level mitigation, and (5) Developing interpersonal skills.

7. Implications of the Study

Several pedagogical implications emerged from the results of the present study. To begin with, the study could be an attempt to contribute to the English language teacher supervisors and English language schools and institutes. Language schools and institutes need to integrate courses for training supervisors in language preparation program to instruct them supervision models and approaches and to reduce the dominance of supervisors' traditional role as an authority figure. Until language teacher supervisors do not change their behaviors and views of supervision, there will be no change on teachers' resistance of language teacher supervision.

Authors' Contributions

All authors contributed significantly to the research process.

Declaration

We declare that this manuscript is original and has not been submitted to any other journal for publication

Transparency Statements

The authors affirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article. Any additional data can be obtained from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

The authors do not have any financial or non-financial competing interests.

Ethical Consideration

This manuscript adheres to the ethical guidelines provided by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) for ensuring integrity and transparency in the research publication process.

Reference

- Agheshteh, H. (2019). Deconstructing the discourse: Mitigation in the supervisory discourse of language teacher supervisors in Iran. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 8(2), 137-162, DOI:10.22054/ilt.2020.39392.373.
- Agheshteh, H., Mehrpur, S. (2021). Teacher Autonomy and Supervisor Authority: Power Dynamics in Language Teacher Supervision in Iran. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 9(1), 87-106. doi: 10.30466/ijltr.2021.120977
- Amini, S., & Gholami, J. (2018). Professional development of EFL teachers through rotatory peer supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, 20(2), 101-117.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). Introduction to research in education. USA: Wadsworth.
- Azizpour, S., Gholami, J. (2021). Iranian Language School Managers' Attitudes towards EFL Teacher Supervision. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 9(35), 53-69.
- Baily, K. M. (2006). Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, K. M. (2009). Language teacher supervision. In A. Burns, & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to language teacher education* (pp. 269-278). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bedford, C. & Gehlert, K. M. (2013). Situational supervision: Applying situational leadership to clinical supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 32(1), 56-69.

- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Copeland, P., Dean, R. G., & Wladkowski, S. P. (2011). The power dynamics of supervision: ethical dilemmas. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 81(1), 26-40.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction*, London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1991). *Discipline and punish: The birth of a prison*. London: Penguin.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Garver, R., & Maloney, T. (2020). Redefining supervision: A joint inquiry into preparing school-based leaders to supervise for equity. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 15(4), 330-355.
- Green, M. S., & Dekkers, T. D. (2010). Attending to power and diversity in supervision: An exploration of supervisee learning outcomes and satisfaction with supervision. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 22, 293-312.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management and organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., & Johnson, D. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Herschensohn, J., & Young-Scholten, M. (eds.) (2013). *The Cambridge handbook of second language acquisition*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Inman, A. G. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisory process and outcome. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 32 (1), 73-85.
- Mehrpour, S., & Agheshteh, H. (2017). Supervisory feedback efficiency: Developing a framework based on Iranian EFL teachers' and supervisors' perceptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(3), 24-33.
- Monchinski, T. (2008). *Critical pedagogy and the everyday classroom*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Murphy, M. J., & Wright, D. W. (2005). Supervisees' perspectives of power use in supervision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 31, 283-295.
- Myles, F. (2013). Theoretical approaches. In J. Herschensohn & M. Young-Scholten (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 46-70). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Potter, J. (1996a). Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction. *London: Sage*. 14
- Potter, J. (1996b). Attitudes, social representations, and discursive psychology. In M. Wetherell, (Ed.) *Identities, groups and social issues* (pp. 119-173). London: Sage.
- Phillips, A., & Park Rogers, M. (2020). Examining the tensions between rapport with pre-service teachers and authority in becoming a teacher educator. *Studying Teacher Education*, 1-21.

- Razmjoo, S. A., & Rasti, A. (2014). Scratching the knowledge base surface of ministry of education (MOE) English teacher supervisors in Iran. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 3(2), 39-46.
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*. London: Longman.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1996). Consciousness as a problem for the psychology of behavior. In R. Rieber (ed.), *the collected works of L. S. Vygotsky: Vol. 3. Problems of the theory and history of psychology*. New York and London: Plenum Press. (Original work published 1925).
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wajnryb, R. (1994). *The pragmatics of feedback: A study of mitigation in the supervisory discourse of TESOL teacher educators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW, Australia.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2017). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.