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Abstract

The process of supervision directly impacts teachers and students in a school. The current study revolved around the comparison of instructional supervision practices carried out by the principals of APS&Cs and FGEIs in Pakistan and its impact on professional development of teachers. A quantitative approach was used to conduct the current study. Sampling was carried out through multi-stage stratified random sampling technique. The study comprised 600 teachers and 120 principals from APS&Cs and FGEIs. The data was collected through questionnaires and the reliability was .871 and .766 respectively. Statistical techniques for instance, t-test, standard deviation, and mean were used for the analysis of acquired data. The findings of the study revealed that the concept of supervision is a much broader phenomenon than inspection. Moreover, it is the duty of the heads of institutions to develop interactive, healthy, and accommodating environment for teachers. The principals need to utilize available resources in institutions in such a way that it results in overall enhancement of teaching-learning process. Moreover, the head of institutions should collaborate and guide the teachers. It would help the teachers to reinforce their competencies in field of teaching which would ultimately result in overall performance.
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Introduction

In the process of teaching and learning, the role of teachers, for the promotion of learning and enhancement of students’ knowledge remains vital. Instructional supervision is one of the key elements of school administration that provides an opportunity to the schools to enhance their learning. It also provides special opportunities for teachers to excel in their
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profession (Arong & Ogbadu, 2010; Kutsyuruba, 2003) as it is necessary for the effectiveness of school. (Rahayu et al., 2018). Instructional supervision in fact, is a school-based (in-school) supervision practiced by the members of school’s staff for instance principals, office heads, senior teachers, and appointed directors. They are inclined to provide direction, bolster, and constant feedback to educators for their professional improvement and enhancement in their skills (Arong & Ogbadu, 2010; Maisyaroh et al., 2021).

Instructional supervision focuses on the development of schools by facilitating teachers to emulate professionalism through clarifying their concepts of educational practices and to grow professionally (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). The procedure of supervision of guidance by the organizations’ heads infer to manage the entire learning process. This process involves the fundamental phase of lesson planning, the reliability of educators, academic methods, sufficient usage of instructional aids, criticism of the students' errand, and check into prior supervision (Toprakci et al., 2016).

Instructional supervision is related to continuous, enduring, and sturdy improvement in the educating and learning process (Ali, 2000). The point of convergence is that other than realizing change through the supervisor's direction, the teacher should endeavor to enhance his/her abilities without anyone else's input through assessment. The applications related to supervision of instruction are relatively concerned with the improvement of instruction and guidance (Salvador & Tovera, 2016). The primary obligation of supervision is to fulfill the responsibility of professional development of teachers. Professional improvement is a basic requirement of successful supervision as it facilitates the teachers with supervisors’ expertise and educates them the art of instruction. Furthermore, teachers are pulled in to proficient advancement since they trust it would add to upgrade their insight and abilities, contribute to their development, and improve their viability with learners (Kamindo, 2008). The purpose of the current study was to throw light on a simultaneous and comparative study of both these chains being administered by the Pakistan Army.

Literature Review

Beycioglu and Donmez (2009) expressed that school supervision is changing in its trends, such as a controlled system which reviews and limits
the teachers for not making mistakes. Moreover, a training which also permits schools, particularly at present, to have its individuals administer themselves in joint efforts and self-motivated groups. Supervision conducted by the school faculty (principals, division heads, senior educators, and selected administrators) went for giving direction, support, and consolation to the teaching faculty for their professional enhancement and development. Additionally, it also brings change in the process of teaching and learning, which pass along the framework based on shared culture and conviction (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000; Tyagi, 2010).

Kursunoglu and Tanrıogen (2009) clarified the role of principal in an effective way. It measures and relates to the acknowledgment of the educator's conduct for changes in personality. Being instructional supervisors, principals may be evaluated for their role to train their subordinate teachers (Farley, 2010; Sindhvad, 2009). In an organization, the supervisor is supposed to regulate an employee’s performance as demanded by the organization (Collins, 2016). Like different administrators of associations, facilitators need to manage similar issues pertaining to training with a specific end goal to enhance the proficiency of the staff that they supervise. Bovalino (2007) expressed that those educational systems attain the position of successful setting where the principal is supposed to play the role of a suitable commander, takes part in advance development, and always shares his discernment (Benigno, 2017).

Ghavifekr et al. (2015) opined that the implementation of instructional supervision by the heads impacts the achievement of academic goals tremendously. Besides, proficient administration, steady supervision of educators' advancement, and teachers' specialized advancement in professional schools is required by a good supervisor. Few objectives of school may contrast in any case, however, development of teacher’s part is an incessant goal of supervisors (Kotirde & Yunos, 2015).

Clabo (2010) rates the improvement of teaching staff and other employees very high. The regular and continuous upgradation of the knowledge and abilities of the employees and staff is vital. In this way, not only the capability of the school increases; however, it also helps the administration to accomplish its objectives (Halima et al., 2010). Along with this, the program organized to upgrade the knowledge of the teaching faculty is also very important. It is assumed that the improvement of the staff guarantees the improvement of overall educational system.
Resultantly, it makes the school education and administration system worthwhile (Mackey, 2016; Martinez-Valiunas, 2011).

It is the prime responsibility of the supervisor to organize all the duties of the teachers in a balanced way. It includes time allocation, monitory distribution, and judicious allotment of tasks to various individuals. The balanced and judicious approach would facilitate in smooth execution of the tasks (Comighud et al. 2020). Additionally, the just and balanced time management linked with the availability of teachers and accessibility of time would help to honor the abilities of teachers (Benigno, 2017; Morki, 2010). The main objective of instructional supervision is to help and support the educator. They change, improve, endorse, and ultimately apply it in the classrooms (McQuarrie & Wood, 1991).

The possibility of improvement in teaching staff is one of the significant elements of the concept of supervision in instructional process (Wairimu, 2016). According to Bernard (2015), the association, upgradation in training techniques, enhancement in teachers' knowledge, and teachers’ teaching skill is interconnected with the process of supervision. Different techniques are used in various perspectives in schools to determine the effectiveness of teachers’ performance (Wiyono & Burhanuddin, 2020). The evaluation of teachers during the instruction and feedback after the process of supervision helps to bring better changes. Morki (2010) stated that instructional supervision is important for the development of educators and the variables which impact the supervision of guidance in the schools.

The teachers’ professional advancement could be upgraded through four essential procedures. These procedures include the arrangement followed by systematic help, guided directions for organized, continuous staff improvement programs and strengthened by teaching. Moreover, it also helps to execute critical thinking techniques in order to associate new information on the perspective of reflection and already established knowledge (Atnafu, 2014; Glickman et al., 2001).

The classroom teachers ought to be given required time for their learning, improvement, and expert advancement. It would not only be followed by before and during their routine instructional obligations; however, after the feedback of the supervisors too (Tefsaw & Hofman, 2012). All the teachers must be engaged in perceiving the practices, assessing strategies and teaching approaches consciously (Nasreen & Shah,
Henceforth, it would lead to better comprehension of the teaching learning process. It may also result in a change in their instructional methodology and classroom settings (Mannan et al., 2016). Keeping in view the already conferred diversity of supervisory methodologies, supervisors ought to execute appropriate strategies as per the prerequisites of the professional development of teachers (Kursunoglu & Tanrıogen, 2009; Wairimu, 2016).

Fourthly, institutes’ administrator should advance towards a culture that provides indispensable position to proficient and friendly connections among members, (for instance, group arranging, sharing, evaluation, and figuring out how to build up component for companion survey of training). These practices enhance the development of the staff, improvement of thoughts, and shared learning (Mackey, 2016). Teachers and supervisors working in coordination would definitely encourage the teacher development program and help to enhance learner’s comprehension. The projects that are meant for the development of the teachers ought to be far reaching and consistent projects, specially sorted out for the improvement of individuals and institute (Hoque et al., 2020; Wairimu, 2016).

Rationale

Army Public Schools & Colleges with Federal Government Educational Institutions are two diverse chains of academics administered by Pakistan Army. FGEIs fall in public sector, while APS & Cs are private sector institutions. Army tries to ensure quality instruction and administration of these institutions. The role of both of these institutions is very important in secondary education in Pakistan, as these are the only two chains which provide education in state of AJ & K, all four provinces, and Gilgit Baltistan. The role of head of institutions is always vital in schools. The current study compared the role of principals as supervisors and the practices adopted by them. It’s a unique study as no scholar has compared the role of principals of the two largest chains of academic institutions in their previous researches. It is also important to investigate the supervisory role of principals under the supervision of Pakistan Army officers.

Research Questions

The current study deals with the following research questions:

1. What are the differences and similarities in the instructional supervisory practices followed by principals of APS&Cs and FGEIs?
Principal as Instructional Supervisor...

2. What purpose instructional supervision serves to improve professional development of teachers in APS&Cs and FGEIs?

Statement of the Problem

In order to find the supervisory skills for the professional development of teachers used in both categories of schools organized by the Pakistan army, the current study investigated both of the academic dimensions on parallel level. The research also throws light on the teachers' states of minds towards supervisory practices and their notion of agreement with such practices. The findings of the research provided a description of educators' impression of supervisory practices. Therefore, it was decided whether the teachers were satisfied with such practices and their impact on professional development or not. The practical supervisory process and quality of education may be improved with the help of teachers' opinion.

Methodology

The current study focused to explore the supervisors’ instructional role with regard to the teachers’ professional development through APS&Cs and FGEIs principals. For this purpose, quantitative approach was used. The sample of the study comprised all staff members from both academic chains. Equal numbers of teachers and principals (300 teachers and 60 principals) were selected as the sample. A multi-stage stratified random sampling technique was used to conduct the study. The data was collected through two different questionnaires. The first questionnaire was meant for the head of the institutions of both the chains, while the second one for the teaching staff. Both these questionnaires were adapted from Alkrdem (2011). These were utilized in the research titled, “School-based instructional supervision in Saudi Arabian public secondary schools”. After the opinion of relevant educationists, review of literature, and ground conditions of both the chains of schools, changes were made in the language and content of both the questionnaires.

Table 1
Distribution of Population and Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Schools</th>
<th>Population Principals</th>
<th>Population Teachers</th>
<th>Sample Principals</th>
<th>Sample Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGEIs</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>5130</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS&amp;Cs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8966</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firstly, a pilot study was conducted in 6 schools which contributed towards the selection of sample of the current study, consisting 6 principals and 24 teachers (4 teachers form each school). The reliability of the data was scaled out through Cronbach’s Alpha. After the pilot test, reliability of the survey of the teachers was 0.871, while the principals’ was 0.766. In the next phase, data collection was carried out through close ended questionnaires. It was collected from both chains of the schools, that is, principals and teachers. The collected data was examined with the help of Statistical Package for Social Science program. T-test, mean, and standard deviation were utilized through data analysis. Later on, the results of the analyzed data helped to deduct the conclusion and further to present recommendations of the study.

Results

Table 2
Comparison between FGEIs and APS&Cs Principals and Teachers regarding Communication of School’s Mission to the Teachers and its Achievement of Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicates the school’s mission effectively</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>from each sector</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops goals that are easily attainable by teachers</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>from each sector</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>from each sector</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>from each sector</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents the comparison of mean scores responses between the principals and the FGEIs and APS&Cs regarding the communication of school’s mission. It reveals that there was sufficient difference between mean scores regarding the school’s mission (teachers Mean scores = 3.39 and 2.92, principals Mean scores = 3.74 and 3.11), develop attainable goals (teachers Mean scores = 3.01 and 2.92, principals Mean scores = 4.08 and 3.10) respectively. One of the major aims of schools was that the staff must be well aware of the aim so that they would be positively pursued to achieve it with the help of their professional skills. It is necessary to communicate
the main objectives from the upper to lower staff so that all the staff would focus on the same streamline.

### Table 3

*Comparison between FGEIs and APS&Cs Principals and Teachers Regarding the Feedback Mechanism and Importance of Instructional Supervision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discusses utility of process of supervision with teachers</td>
<td>APS, Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides teachers information about familiarization of supervisory process</td>
<td>APS, Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages teachers to evaluate their own teaching (self-evaluation)</td>
<td>APS, Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carries out one on one interviews with teachers for gathering knowledge and information about their practices in the classroom</td>
<td>APS, Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that all teachers in the school receive supervisory feedback</td>
<td>APS, Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange meetings of the teaching after regular time interval</td>
<td>APS, Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 reflects the mean scores responses of the teachers and principals of APS&Cs and FGEIs regarding the importance of instructional supervision and the feedback mechanism. It highlights that there was significant difference between mean scores regarding the usefulness of classroom supervision (teachers Mean scores = 2.74 and 2.12, principals Mean scores = 3.94 and 1.92), provide an adequate amount of information (teachers Mean scores = 2.75 and 2.04, principals Mean scores = 3.00 and 1.52), encourages teachers to evaluate their own teaching (teachers Mean scores = 2.44 and 2.11, principals Mean scores = 2.95 and 1.48), hold face-to-face interviews with teachers (teachers Mean scores = 4.59 and 2.57), teachers receive supervisory feedback (teachers Mean scores = 2.00 and 1.96, principals Mean scores = 2.48 and 1.87), staff meetings (teachers Mean scores = 3.84 and 2.97, principals Mean scores = 2.95 and 2.58) respectively. Table also reveals that there was no significant difference between mean scores of principals of FGEIs and APS&Cs regarding the arrangement of one on one interviews of the teachers (Mean scores = 3.74 and 3.81). Feedback from the head as supervisor helps the teachers improve and gain excellence in their work.

Table 4

Comparison between FGEIs and APS&Cs Teachers and Principals Regarding the Creation of Professional Growth Opportunity and Remedial Measures by the Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creates professional growth opportunities for teachers</td>
<td>APS Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>Teachers ($n = 300$ from each sector)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals ($n = 60$ from each sector)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes corrective action on instructional matters of teachers in order to improve quality of teaching</td>
<td>APS Cs FGEIs</td>
<td>Teachers ($n = 300$ from each sector)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals ($n = 60$ from each sector)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 reflects the comparison of mean scores responses between the principals and teachers of FGEIs and APS&Cs regarding the creation of professional growth opportunity and remedial measures by the principals. It highlights that between mean scores regarding professional growth opportunities for teachers, significant difference was observed (teachers Mean scores = 2.75 and 2.12, principals Mean scores = 3.38 and 1.16), taking steps to enhance the standard of instruction (teachers Mean scores = 3.93 and 2.86, principals Mean scores = 2.95 and 2.13), set up specific sessions with teachers (teachers Mean scores = 4.17 and 3.24, principals Mean scores = 3.76 and 2.75), inform the teachers about evaluation (teachers Mean scores = 2.44 and 2.95, principals Mean scores = 1.91 and 1.13), identify areas in which improvement is needed by the teachers (principals Mean scores = 3.75 and 1.95). While table also revealed that there was no significant difference between mean scores of FGEIs and APS&Cs teachers regarding the identification of areas in which teachers’ teaching needs to be improved (Mean scores = 2.97 and 2.97). In schools, excellence in academic standard may be attained by improvement in standard of teaching. As a matter of fact, the efficiency is main component. This efficiency may be attained by just and systematic process of
monitoring and supervision. A supervisor provides or creates such opportunities for the teachers to enhance their abilities.

**Table 5**

*Comparison between FGEIs and APS&Cs Teachers and Principals Regarding Motivation by the Principals to the Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes efforts to reduce teachers’ level of anxiety concerning the supervisory program</td>
<td>APS Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APS Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliments teachers privately for their performance</td>
<td>APS Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APS Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes and rewards excellent teachers</td>
<td>APS Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APS Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs Teachers (n = 300 from each sector)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cs FGEIs Principals (n = 60 from each sector)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 presents the relationship of responses of means scores between the principals and the teachers of FGEIs and APS&Cs regarding motivation by the principals to the teachers. It shows that there was significant difference between mean scores regarding efforts for reduction of anxiety among teachers to (teachers Mean scores = 1.81 and 1.33, principals Mean scores = 3.26 and 1.24), compliment teachers privately for their performance (teachers Mean scores = 2.98 and 1.96, principals Mean scores = 1.91 and 1.24), recognize and rewards excellent teachers (teachers Mean scores = 2.42 and 2.01, principals Mean scores = 2.91 and 1.90) respectively. Motivation plays an important role in the performance of teachers. Instructional supervisor is willing to support the teachers to overcome any hinderance faced by teachers inside or outside the class.
Supervision must create healthy environment for the staff so that they could discuss their problems and principal should try to find solutions too. Supervision helps to provide positive feedback, encouragement, enhances skills, and helps to excel the performance of teachers.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The current research investigated the supervisory practices of the professional development of teachers in two diverse chains of schools. In compatibility of the research questions, it was discovered that the teachers and the principals of APS&Cs and FGEIs carried comparable discernment regarding the process of instructional supervision conducted by their principals in their respective schools. The study uncovered that as compared to the teachers, principals were more particular about the conduct of supervision. The responses were a bit contrasting to each other. It was also revealed that the principals provided opportunities for professional enhancement, achievement of instructional goals, classroom administration, and developing new skills in their teachers. Moreover, the study also uncovered that a large number of teachers emphasized that their principals provide cooperation, facilitate in coordinated efforts, and render guidance in usage of accessible resources. The findings of this research were a bit similar to the previous researches, such as Hoque et al. (2020), Nasreen, and Shah (2019). It showed that the process of supervision in the instructional process effects the behavior, performance, and motivation of teachers.

The results of Khan (2012) also showed a similar outcome that the principals of schools not only utilized best techniques to accomplish school objectives; however, they also proved themselves as good facilitators and guides to their teachers. The investigation uncovered that the principals of both the chains claimed that they, as often as possible, try to supervise the classes and check the performance of teachers inside the class. They also share their observations and feedback with teachers, listen to their perspectives, evaluate them, appreciate them, and give instructions for future course of action. APS&C principals obtained comparatively higher mean scores than FGEIs. The FGEIs principals seldom encouraged the teachers, offered them help and direction after the supervisory visits. Additionally, they were not sure about providing opportunities to the teachers for their professional development after the visits and feedback sessions. The findings of the study also revealed that the head of institutions lacked training in supervision. Moreover, there was a stressful and strained
environment between principals and teachers. According to the findings, lack of supervisory training was observed in principals. Additionally, a strained relationship was found between teachers and supervisors. Furthermore, administrative authorities do not extend support to the principals in handling awkward situations. Supervisors may frequently be competent in their field of study; however, they might not possess the professional credentials or ongoing training necessary to keep their knowledge and skills up to date for effective supervision. The above mentioned findings were in accordance with the research of U-Sayee and Adomako (2021) about principal supervision which was encumbered by lack of resources for teachers, inexperience teachers, nonprofessional behavior of teachers, and shortage of employee in school.

The conclusions of Dangara (2015) and current study showed similarities specially in case of visit of the principals to the classes. These similarities included taking observations of teachers after evaluating their teaching methodology, orchestrate gatherings with teachers, distinguish issues amid guidance, and providing future line of action. Tesfaw and Hofman (2012) underpinned the outcomes that the process of supervision in instruction carries an unmistakable association with the development of the teachers. The principals are well aware of the needs and requirements of the teachers and they provide them appropriate guidance and counselling. The study revealed that the opinions of both the principals and teachers of Army Public Schools were same about supervision in their school. They also explained that principals, as often as possible; took detailed visit of the schools, check teachers’ promptness, assess teaching approach, lesson plan, assess teachers’ background knowledge, and use of training aids. Contrary to that, principals of FGEIs rarely pursued the procedure of instructional supervision in their school. They were not regular in their visits to the classes and lacked proper and organized feedback mechanism. According to Lang (2017), the teaching faculty disagrees with the process, execution, feedback, and overall conduct of instructional supervision in their schools by the head of institutions. According to teachers, neither does it help in their professional development nor it provides a healthy motivational environment.

Recommendations

Following recommendations were made on the basis of conclusions and discussions:
Principal as Instructional Supervisor...

1. There is a need to improve communication with teachers, especially the principals of FGIEs.

2. Communication gap between teachers and administrators is required to be reduced and provide healthy environment.

3. Feedback mechanism after the process of supervision needs to be organized and streamlined.

4. Opportunities for professional growth should be provided to teachers in the light of observations by the supervisors.

5. Instructional supervisor ought to be a facilitator by educating teachers about modern and innovative teaching techniques as course of professional development.

6. Supervisors should not be keen in finding errors of teachers. Rather, teachers should be motivated to share the problems regarding teaching, curriculum, students’ behavior, and provision of teaching aids with the principals.

7. Concerned administrative authorities regulating both these academic chains should provide opportunities for grooming of principals. It includes conduct of cadres, seminars, workshops, and courses for the principals.
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