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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The major objective of the research was an exploration of the impact of Head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices in Government Secondary Schools on teachers’ performance.

Design/Methodology/Approach: In this descriptive research, data was collected through a survey. The population was all the female and male head-teachers and teachers of Government high secondary schools of Sargodha. Sample of 75 schools and their head teachers and 225 teachers from each school were selected by multistage random sampling technique. Two rating scales were used to collect data. Pearson r and descriptive statistics watershed for data analysis.

Findings: The conclusion of the study was that there was a significant positive relationship between head teachers’ supervisory practices and teachers’ performance.

Implications/Originality/Value: On the basis of conclusion, in-service training for both the teachers and the head teachers are commended.
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Introduction

Educational condition of Pakistan is poor since its existence. Though this system was inherited from the British colonial era, it has been remained miserable in both qualitative and quantitative aspects. Most of countries having low level of the economy than Pakistan has higher literacy rate than that of Pakistan. In formal education system of Pakistan, teaching to the students, is considered to be the duty of the teacher or instructor, and head teachers don’t prefer to involve directly in instructional process. Some of the head teachers manage their time to keep themselves
involved in delivering knowledge. Beach, & Reinhartz, (1989) stated that head teachers’ instructional practices increase the education quality.

To achieve the educational goals, Head teacher plays a dynamic role in preparing, designing, directing, leading and implementing process for educational programs (Esia-Donkoh, & Baffoe, 2018). Regulation of teachers’ instructions is major element of the supervisory functions of a head teacher within a school. So, it is evident that instructional supervision is a fundamental function to improve the instructional process in schools (Tesfaw, & Hofman, 2012). According to Behlol, Yousuf, Parveen, Kayani (2011) functions of school supervision are close working with teachers, developing effective team and strong morale in the team, helping teachers to develop greater competencies, helping new teachers to transform theories into practices, helping teachers in remediating students’ learning difficulties, guide the teachers for curriculum interventions and evaluate the teachers’ effectiveness.

In the educational process, teachers play a lively role in classroom learning for the formation of human resources and it is possible when they are motivated by their supervisors (Sardiman, 2001). Teachers with the help of their supervisor’s motivation encourage their students in achieving their educational goals such as becoming noble, creative, skilled, knowledgeable people (Law of the Republic of Indonesia, 2003).

Teachers’ performance is often judged from the students’ academic achievement. Teachers’ performance is taken as excellent if their students achieve high goals. Head teachers’ guidance, facilitation, and inspection have been strong influencing variables of teachers’ performance.

**Statement of the Problem**

Whenever problems connected to the failure or success of a system of education are discussed the authorities always include instructional supervisory practices in the list of problematic factors. Hence this inquiry was carried out to explore the impact of School heads’ instructional supervisory practices on the performance of teachers.

**Objectives of the Study**

Objectives were to

1. Find out School heads’ instructional supervisory practices, serving in government schools.
2. Explore the teaching performance of the teachers serving in Government secondary schools.
3. Find out the impact of instructional supervisory practices of School heads on performance of the teachers of Government schools.

**Study Questions**

1. What are the levels of School heads’ instructional supervisory practices?
2. What are the levels of teachers’ performance?
3. Is there any relationship between instructional School heads’ supervisory and teachers’ performance?

**Review of related literature**

Supervision is the function of regulating some tasks or somebody. A person who does supervision is called ‘supervisor’, and anyone being supervised is ‘supervisee’ (Kendra, & Smith, 2009).

**Instructional supervision**

Goal of Instructional Supervision is to raise performance of the teachers to create valuable learning opportunities for the students. The supervisor can achieve these objectives by explicitly defining plans for the instructors, and by creating possibilities for the instructors to learn at local,
divisional, provisional, and federal obligations. An effective supervisor can also offer the support for his/her staff in various ways, like to conduct a workshop for them, be available to them and to nurture their growth by completing through guidance. Moreover, head teacher as instructional supervisor has to work with students’ parents and staff to provide help to learners with a significant educational skill which can prove beneficial for the students in their future plans for career. Head teachers play a central part in every school’s accomplishment of desired goals including teachers’ best performances and students’ better achievements.

According to Merriam-Webster dictionary, the literary meaning of practices is to do something, again and again to make improvements in doing it better (Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary). According to Lim Hui (2010) in the success of a department, the most vital thing is the functions of a Head as a leader of the educational institution. At school level, usually school’s senior team management takes the ownership of supervision, and provide guidance and support to the teachers.

Lashway (2002) states that providing feedback and keep monitoring in the teaching process is essential. He narrates that a leader monitors and provides feedback, is a “facilitative leader”. He believes that outcome of these processes (feedback and monitoring) reflects in performance of students and teachers. It is understandable that providing feedback of supervision has a direct impact on instructional leadership. Likewise, Yousaf, Usman, & Islam (2018) narrated that the system of monitoring and giving feedback shows vital impression on performance of students and teachers. Departmental Heads are responsible for their duties like addressing the instructional issues, monitoring the classrooms; providing support to the teachers, improving the programs with the help of learners’ progress data, and providing feedback to the teachers. The practice of monitoring and providing feedback can happen if Head of Departments conduct his/her duties efficiently. Moreover, Chang, (2001) described that spending more time of instructional leaders in observing and monitoring improves the performance of teachers.

**Instructional Supervisory Practices**

David, & Madriaga (2015) described factors of instructional supervisory practices discussed as follows.

**Collaboration**

The major aim of the instructional supervision is to improve instructional practices and school success and this is only possible by democratic and collaborative work among educators to elevate student achievement, educational equity, and teacher development (Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, 2001).

Observation, giving his feedback, support, and guidance of the supervisor to the supervisee is one phase of supervision that makes the transformation. According to Shantz and Ward (2000) for the improvement of instructions, teachers depend on supervisors’ feedback. Positive critics and constructive assistance by supervisors is very important in developing teachers’ efficiency (Yousaf, Usman, & Islam, 2018).

**Professional Development**

Professional development of a teacher means enhancing teachers’ ability to meet students’ needs, make instruction effective and polishing the skills of managing classroom along with creating a culture of professionalism (Kutsyuruba, 2003). He further added that Head teachers’ supervision of teachers offers opportunities to teachers for improving learning and teaching, and teachers’ professional development.

**Leadership Skills**

Head teachers’ leadership skills are fundamental factors for schools effectiveness (Blackburn, 2009). Principals of schools having good leadership skills can develop school climate for quality
process of learning and teaching; student attitudes; assessment; two-way communication; accountability and non-academic as well academic performance; Promising school culture; and relationship among school, community and families (Bolanle, 2013; Chen, 2008).

**Assistance and Support**

The head teachers’ support to the teachers and the performance of those teachers are connected with each other. This support is considered very much important in the progress of the educational quality in schools (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

**Oversight Responsibility**

Generally, supervision involves oversight of the planning and implementation of school programs, and professional support to teaching practices, assessment measures and students well-being. Head teachers are always in control of the school functions and effectiveness teachers utilizing school resources for the oversight and leadership (Chen, 2018).

**Inspection**

School principals as supervisors also play the role of inspectors. As an inspector every school head has the responsibility of monitoring and guiding the work of teachers to enhance the instructional practices and teaching performance (Ongori, 2015).

**Removing Hindrances**

Removing hindrances and barriers is also a component of supervision. A conflict may arise between supervisors and supervisees which may contribute in a positive or negative way. It is important for head teachers to manage conflict and improve their supervision for better outcomes (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014).

**Teachers’ Performance**

Quality of education depends on teachers’ performance. Performance of teachers is an intricate phenomenon and is defined differently but the major target is the achievement or accomplishment of any assigned task. Swartz et al., (1990) stated five functions of teacher’s performance: time management of instructions, students’ behavior, instructional monitoring, instructional presentations and instructional feedback.

According to Mehmood (2011) all good teachers do well when they are informing, explaining, and showing how to perform the given tasks under the specified standards.

**Management and Organization of Classrooms**

Good management of the classrooms play very important role in making the classroom environment feasible for teaching and learning. A teacher faces many children daily. It is hoped that if the children live together, they may turn out to be a fused group. An essential duty of the teacher is to develop a group to work with a team spirit for common goals and common educational interests (Shindler, 2009). Further classroom organization is to form groups of students struggle together to attain common objectives in organized manner. It is known as the coordination and proper working environment which makes an education system able to run effectively and efficiently to meet its specified goals (Oliver, & Reschly, 2010).

**Support to Culture**

Culture may be referred to as the beliefs; values; ways of thinking and norms or characteristics of folks living in the society. If a teacher supports the school culture besides his academic activities, the school will go towards the sustainable development (Raza, 2010) because the improvements done for positive organizational culture have lasting effect.
Support to Students
Children who are becoming familiarized to say as they accept as true, explaining their thinking, they are adapting to live in this world and accepting diversity. Children in school are going to lead the society (Berberoglu, 2011) in future. To help clarify the students’ personal problems, a teacher should create different opportunities for the students according to their attitudes, interests and feasibilities (Sibley, 2017).

Research Methodology
In this descriptive study, survey technique was used in the study (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001).

Population and Sampling
All the female and male head teachers and all the female and male teachers of 279 government secondary schools of Sargodha were included in population.

For taking a representative sample, tehsil Sargodha was selected among all Tehsils of district Sargodha. On the basis of 50% of population 150 total female and male Government secondary schools were randomly selected and from each school one head teacher and two teachers were selected conveniently.

Research instruments
A questionnaire for head teacher on instructional supervisory practices scale (ISPS) and teachers’ performance scale (TPS) was developed after reviewing the instrument of Raza, (2010). There were seven factors in head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices, i.e. collaboration, professional development (PD), assistance & support, oversight responsibility, leadership skills, removal of hindrances, and inspection; for each factor five statements and for last hindrances four statements were included. Teachers’ performance scale consisted of three factors i.e. measuring management & organization, support to children & school culture, and learning & teaching; for each factor, there were six statements.

To check the face and content validity expert opinions were sought out to validate the instruments. Instruments were pilot tested after improvement in the light of the experts’ suggestions. ISPS was administered to 20 head teachers and TPS was administered to 50 teachers. Cronbach alpha Reliability values of the ISPS and TPS scales were 0.720 and 0.915 respectively.

Data was collected through self-visits. Data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation.

Data Analysis & Results

| S# | Construct                                                                 | SA f (%) | AG f (%) | UN f (%) | DA f (%) | SDA f (%) | Total f(%) | Mean  | SD   |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|-------|------|
| 1. | My interaction with the staff is official.                               | 18       | 26       | 4        | 18       | 9         | 75         | 3.347 | 1.3  |
|    |                                                                           | 24%      | 34.7%    | 5.3%     | 24%      | 12%       | 100%       |       |      |
| 2. | The rules set by me in school are never questioned by any member of the school. | 12       | 26       | 8        | 22       | 7         | 75         | 3.187 | 1.2  |
|    |                                                                           | 16%      | 34.7%    | 10%      | 29.3%    | 9.3%      | 100%       |       |      |
| 3. | Faculty meetings are mainly Head Teacher-report meetings.                | 18       | 31       | 7        | 14       | 5         | 75         | 3.573 | 1.2  |
|    |                                                                           | 24%      | 41.3%    | 9.3%     | 18.7%    | 6.7       | 100%       |       |      |
4. I develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures for instruction.  

|   | SA f (%) | AG f (%) | UN f (%) | DA f (%) | SDA f (%) | Total f (%) | Mean | SD |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------|----|
| 25 | 45 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 75 | 4.213 | 0.7 |
| 33.3% | 60% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 1.3% | 100% |

5. I visit classroom regularly to observe teachers’ performance.  

|   | SA f (%) | AG f (%) | UN f (%) | DA f (%) | SDA f (%) | Total f (%) | Mean | SD |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------|----|
| 28 | 34 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 75 | 4.13 | .87 |
| 37.7% | 45.3% | 12% | 4% | 1.3% | 100% |

Table 1 depicts that many of the school’s heads (59%) with favoring “mean score 3.347 and SD = 1.39”, expressed agreement that their interaction with teachers is official. Similarly, many of the school heads (51%) with supporting “mean score 3.18 and SD = 1.28”, were in agreement that the rules set by the head teachers in the school are never questioned by any member of school but 38.6% head teachers showed disagreement towards that statement. Many of the head teachers (65.3%) with mean supporting value 3.57 and SD = 1.2, agreed that faculty meetings are mainly head teacher report meetings. Most of the head teachers (93.3%) with favoring mean score 4.21 and SD = 0.74, agreed that head teachers develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures for instruction. Most of the head teachers (83%) with supporting mean 4.13 and SD = 1.1, agreed that head teachers visit classrooms regularly to observe teachers’ performance. Overall 70% of Head teachers claimed that they have collaboration with teachers in their schools.

Table 2 Professional development of teachers’ instructional supervisory practices

| Construct | SA f (%) | AG f (%) | UN f (%) | DA f (%) | SDA f (%) | Total f (%) | Mean | SD |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------|----|
| 6. I supervise teacher’s work regularly. | 32 | 38 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 75 | 4.28 | .85 |
| 42.7% | 50.7% | 1.3% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 100% |
| 7. I correct the teachers’ mistakes related to instruction. | 31 | 35 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 75 | 4.2 | .92 |
| 41.3% | 46.7% | 5.3% | 4% | 2.7% | 100% |
| 8. I ensure that the teachers work hard. | 26 | 43 | 4 | 2 | - | 75 | 4.24 | .67 |
| 34.7% | 57.3% | 5.3% | 2.7% | - | 100% |
| 9. I get the employees to work together as a team. | 31 | 41 | 2 | 1 | - | 75 | 4.36 | .61 |
| 41.3% | 54.7% | 2.7% | 1.3% | - | 100% |
| 10. I encourage teacher’s participation in official work. | 33 | 30 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 75 | 4.19 | .94 |
| 44% | 40% | 8% | 6.7% | 1.3% | 100% |
| Total professional development factor | 153 | 187 | 17 | 13 | 5 | 375 | 4.25 | .94 |
| 40.8% | 49.9% | 4.5% | 3.5% | 1.3% | 100% |

Table 2 reflects that most of the school heads (93%) with favouring “mean score 4.28 and SD = 0.84”, agreed that they supervise teacher’s work regularly. Majority of school heads (88%) with supportive “mean score 4.2 and SD = 0.92”, showed agreement that they correct teachers’ mistakes related to instruction. Most of school heads (92%) with favouring “mean value 4.24 and SD = 0.67”, agreed that they ensure the teachers work hard. Most of school heads (96%) with supportive “mean score 4.36 and standard SD = 0.61”, agreed that they get the employees to work together as a team. Majority of heads (84%) with 4.36 mean score and SD = 0.61, agreed that they encourage teacher’s participation in official work. Overall 91% of Head teachers claimed that they do professional development of teachers.

Table 3 Leadership skills of head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices

| S # | Construct | SA f (%) | AG f (%) | UN f (%) | DA f (%) | SDA f (%) | Total f (%) | Mean | Std dv |
|-----|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------|-------|
|     |           |          |          |          |          |           |             |      |       |
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Table 3 shows that most of the school heads (95%) with supportive mean score 4.31 and SD = 0.75, agreed that they set an example of hard work for the teachers. Majority of school heads (88%) with favouring mean score 4.25 and SD = .95, agreed that they came early in school and stay late in the School. Majority of the school heads (94.7%) with supportive mean score 4.4 and SD = 0.68, agreed that their behavior with teachers and other staff is friendly and enthusiastic. Majority of the head teachers (82.7%) with supportive mean score 4.15 and SD = 0.97, agreed that they work in a highly imaginative and creative manner in School. Majority of the head teachers (80%) of head teachers with favoring mean 3.9 and SD = 0.81, agreed that they motivate and lead the teacher into professional expertise. Overall 88% of Head teachers expressed that they have the leadership skills.

Table 4 Assistance and support to teachers

| Sr # | Construct                                                                 | SA | AG | UN | DA | SDA | Total | Mean | SD |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|------|----|
| 16   | I provide guidance to the staff in their teaching work.                  |    |    |    |    |     |       |      |    |
|      |                                                                           | 27 | 43 | 4  | 1  |     | 75    | 4.21 | .81|
|      |                                                                           | 36 | 54.3% | -- | 5.3% | 1.3% | 100% |      |    |
| 17   | I help teachers in solving their personal problems/grievances.            |    |    |    |    |     |       |      |    |
|      |                                                                           | 25 | 37 | 7  | 4  | 2   | 75    | 4.05 | .94|
|      |                                                                           | 33.3% | 49.3% | 9.3% | 5.3% | 2.7% | 100% |      |    |
| 18   | I show high concern and support to teachers.                             |    |    |    |    |     |       |      |    |
|      |                                                                           | 28 | 34 | 9  | 3  | 1   | 75    | 4.13 | .88|
|      |                                                                           | 37.3% | 45.3% | 12% | 4%  | 1.3% | 100% |      |    |
| 19   | I praise the imaginative and creative work of teachers.                  |    |    |    |    |     |       |      |    |
|      |                                                                           | 31 | 42 | 1  | 1  |     | 75    | 4.36 | .65|
|      |                                                                           | 41.3% | 56% | 1.3% | -- | 1.3% | 100% |      |    |
| 20   | I support the teachers to use appropriate teaching methodologies.         |    |    |    |    |     |       |      |    |
|      |                                                                           | 19 | 41 | 6  | 7  | 2   | 75    | 3.90 | 0.97|
|      |                                                                           | 25.3% | 54.7% | 8%  | 9.3% | 2.7% | 100% |      |    |
Table 4 depicts that most of the school heads (90.3%) with supportive mean score 4.21 and SD = 0.81, opine in agreement that they provide guidance to the staff in their teaching work. Whereas, most (82.6%) of school heads with favoring mean score 4.05 and SD = 0.94, expressed that they help teachers in solving their personal problems/grievances. Most of the school heads (97.3%) with a supportive mean score 4.13 and SD = 0.88, expressed concern and support to teachers. Similarly, most of the head teachers (97.3%) with a supportive mean score 4.36 and SD = 0.65, agreed that they do the imaginative and creative work of teachers. The majority of the head teachers (80%) with favoring mean 3.90 and SD = 0.97, agreed that they support the teachers to use appropriate teaching methodologies. Overall, 87% of Head teachers claimed that they provided assistance and support to teachers.

Table 5 Oversight responsibility of head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices

| Sr # | Construct                                           | SA f (%) | AG f (%) | UN f (%) | DA f (%) | SDA f (%) | Total f (%) | Mean | SD |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------|----|
| 21.  | I enjoy professional achievement and accomplishment. | 25 33.3% | 42 56%   | 6 8%     | 1 1.3%   | 1 1.3%    | 75 100%     | 4.19 | .75|
| 22.  | I work energetically and enthusiastically.          | 22 29.3% | 48 64%   | 2 2.7%   | 3 4%     | ---       | 75 100%     | 4.19 | .67|
| 23.  | I am mutually respectful and helpful for teachers. | 34 45.3% | 40 53.3% | ---      | 1 1.3%   | 75 100%   | 4.41 | .64|
| 24.  | I encourage the teachers to keep the morale high    | 33 44%   | 39 52%   | 1 1.3%   | 1 1.3%   | 75 100%   | 4.36 | .71|
| 25.  | I encourage the teachers to follow the punctuality rules. | 27 36%   | 39 52%   | 4 5.3%   | 4 5.3%   | 1 1.3%   | 75 100%   | 4.16 | .85|
|      | Total oversight responsibility factor                | 141 37.6%| 208 55.5%| 13 3.5%  | 9 2.4%   | 4 1.06%   | 375 100%   | 4.26 | .72|

From table 5 it is reflected that the majority of the school heads (89.3%) with supportive mean score 4.19 and SD = 0.75, agreed that they enjoy professional achievement and accomplishment. The majority of school heads (93.3%) with a supportive mean score 4.19 and SD = 0.97, agreed that they work energetically and enthusiastically. Most of the school heads (98.6%) with a supportive mean score 4.41 and SD = 0.64, agreed that they are respectful and helpful for the teachers. The majority of the school heads (96%) with a supportive mean score 4.36 and SD = 0.69, agreed that they encourage the teachers to keep their morale high. Most of the school heads (88%) with a supportive mean 4.26 and SD = 0.72, agreed that they encourage the teachers to follow the punctuality rules. Overall, 93% of the school heads claimed that they perform better oversight responsibility.
Table 6 Inspection factor of head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices

| Sr # | Construct                                                                 | SA (f (%)) | AG (f (%)) | UN (f (%)) | DA (f (%)) | SDA (f (%)) | Total (f (%)) | Mean | Std. dev |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------------|------|---------|
| 26.  | I visit classroom regularly to observe teachers’ performance.             | 21 (28%)   | 26 (34.7%) | 11 (14.7%) | 12 (16%)   | 5 (6.7%)    | 75 (100%)     | 3.61 | 1.2     |
| 27.  | I motivate and guide the teachers towards their professional development.| 25 (33.3%) | 39 (52%)   | 4 (5.3%)   | 7          | ---         | 75 (100%)     | 4.09 | .87     |
| 28.  | I evaluate teachers’ performance related to achieve the school’s pre-determined objectives. | 24 (32%)   | 35 (46.7%) | 9 (12%)    | 5          | 2           | 75 (100%)     | 3.99 | .98     |
| 29.  | I ask the teachers for regular class exams/tests to the students.        | 33 (44%)   | 39 (52%)   | 1 (1.3%)   | 1          | 1           | 75 (100%)     | 4.36 | .71     |
| 30.  | I motivate the teachers for in-time completion of syllabus.              | 27 (36%)   | 39 (52%)   | 4 (5.3%)   | 4          | 1           | 75 (100%)     | 4.16 | 0.8     |

Total oversight responsibility factor

| SA | AG | UN | DA | SDA | Total | Mean | Std. dev |
|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|------|---------|
| 141| 208| 13 | 9  | 4   | 375   | 4.26 | 0.7     |
| 37.6%| 55.5%| 3.5%| 2.4%| 1.06%| 100% | 4.26 | 0.7     |

Table 6 reflects that majority of school heads (62.7%) with favoring mean score 3.61 and SD = 1.24, were in agreement that they visit the classroom regularly to observe performance of teachers. The majority of the school heads (85.3%) with favoring mean score 4.09 and SD = 0.87, were in agreement that they guide and motivate the teachers towards their professional development. Many of the school heads (78.7%) with favoring mean score 3.99 and SD = 0.98, showed agreement that they evaluate teachers’ performance relevant to pre-determined school’s objectives. Many of the school heads (88%) with a supportive mean score 4.2 and SD = 0.91, expressed agreement that they ask the teachers for regular class exams/tests to the students. Most of the head teachers (85.3%) with a supportive mean score 4.08 and SD = 0.89, were in agreement that they motivate the teachers for in-time completion of the syllabus. The overall majority (80%) of the school heads claimed that they carry out inspections.

Table 7 Hindrances in head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices

| Sr # | Construct                                                                 | SA (f (%)) | AG (f (%)) | UN (f (%)) | DA (f (%)) | SDA (f (%)) | Total (f (%)) | Mean | Std. dev |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------------|------|---------|
| 31.  | I have more clerical work to do than instructional work.                  | 28 (37.3%) | 26 (34.7%) | 12 (16.0%) | 9          | ---         | 75 (100%)     | 3.97 | 1.01    |
| 32.  | I have other responsibilities that obstruct my teaching work.             | 27 (36%)   | 39 (52%)   | 4 (5.3%)   | 4          | 1           | 75 (100%)     | 4.16 | .85     |
33. I, as a head teacher, always had been overloaded with work schedule. | 19 | 41 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 75 | 25.3% | 54.7% | 8.0% | 9.3% | 2.7 | 100% | 3.91 | .98

34. I have to fulfill many requirements of authorities. | 24 | 40 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 75 | 32% | 53.3% | 8% | 4.0% | 2.7% | 100% | 4.08 | .89

35. I face difficulties in getting parents / community help. | 28 | 34 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 75 | 37.3% | 45.3% | 12% | 4% | 1.3% | 100% | 4.13 | 0.87

Total Hindrances factor | 126 | 180 | 37 | 26 | 6 | 375 | 33.6% | 48% | 9.86% | 6.93% | 1.6% | 100% | 4.05 | 0.92

From the table 7 it is reflected that majority of the school heads (72%) with favoring mean score 3.97 and SD = 1.01, were in agreement that they have to do more clerical work as compare to instructional work. The majority of the school heads (88%) with supportive mean score 4.16 and SD = 0.85, were in agreement that they have other responsibilities that obstruct their teaching work. Whereas the majority of school heads (80%) with favoring mean score 3.91 and SD = 0.98, were in agreement that they had always been overloaded with work schedules. The majority of the school heads (85.3%) with a supportive mean score 4.08 and SD = 0.89, agreed that they have to fulfill many requirements of authorities. The majority of the school heads (89.3%) with a supportive score 4.3 and SD = 0.87, agreed that they face difficulties in getting parents/community help. The overall majority (82%) of the school heads claimed that they responded better to hindrances.

Head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices were distributed in five levels. The range given to each level of the school heads’ instructional supervisory practices were regarded as per criteria; mean score = less than 2.5 = poor, mean score = 2.5 – 3 = satisfactory, mean score = 3.01 – 3.5 = Good, mean score = 3.51 – 4 = very good and mean score = 4.01– 5 = Excellent.

Table 8 Level of the school heads’ instructional supervisory practices

| Level       | Mean range | Frequency | Percent | Weighted mean | SD  |
|-------------|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----|
| Excellent   | 4.01 – 5   | 45        | 60%     | 4.52          | .704|
| Very good   | 3.51 – 4   | 26        | 34.7%   |               |     |
| Good        | 1.01 – 3.5 | 3         | 4.0%    |               |     |
| Satisfactory| 2.5 – 3    | 0         | 0%      |               |     |
| Poor        | Less than 2.5 | 1    | 1.3%    |               |     |
| Total       | 75         | 100.0     |         |               |     |

In table 8 depicted that overall majority (60%) of the school heads with frequency 45, had excellent level of the school heads’ instructional supervisory practices whereas 34.7% of the school heads showed very good level in their instructional supervisory practices. While 4% of the school heads’ instructional supervisory practices level was good (with mean score 4.52 and SD = .704). Overall level of instructional supervisory practices was very good and excellent.
Analysis of Teachers’ Self-reported Performance

Table 9 Management and organization in teachers’ performance

| Construct                                                                 | SA f (%) | AG f (%) | UN f (%) | DA f (%) | SDA f (%) | Total f (%) | Mean | SD  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------|-----|
| 1. I am regular in performing every educational activity (formal assessments etc). | 97       | 105      | 11       | 7        | 5         | 225         | 4.25 | .86 |
|                                                                            | 43.1%    | 46.7%    | 4.9%     | 3.1%     | 2.2%      | 100%        |      |     |
| 2. Other teachers’ behavior with me is quite friendly and cheerful in School. | 88       | 113      | 14       | 6        | 4         | 225         | 4.22 | .82 |
|                                                                            | 39.1%    | 50.2%    | 6.2%     | 2.7%     | 1.8%      | 100%        |      |     |
| 3. We, as teachers, receive adequate training for our professional needs.  | 83       | 103      | 20       | 13       | 6         | 225         | 4.08 | .96 |
|                                                                            | 36.9%    | 45.8%    | 8.9%     | 5.8%     | 2.7%      | 100%        |      |     |
| 4. I am aware of the national goals of education.                         | 87       | 113      | 12       | 8        | 5         | 225         | 4.19 | .86 |
|                                                                            | 38.7%    | 50.2%    | 5.3%     | 3.6%     | 2.2%      | 100%        |      |     |
| 5. I plan my teaching methods and strategies to achieve desired objectives | 90       | 114      | 8        | 10       | 3         | 225         | 4.24 | .83 |
|                                                                            | 40.0%    | 50.7%    | 3.6%     | 4.4%     | 1.3%      | 100%        |      |     |
| 6. I use classroom management skill effectively.                         | 85       | 120      | 12       | 5        | 3         | 225         | 4.24 | .76 |
|                                                                            | 37.8%    | 53.3%    | 5.3%     | 2.2%     | 1.3%      | 100%        |      |     |
| Total management and Organization factor                                 | 530      | 668      | 77       | 49       | 26        | 1350        | 4.203| .843|
|                                                                            | 39.3%    | 49.48%   | 5.7%     | 3.6%     | 1.9%      | 100%        |      |     |

Table 9 shows that most of the teachers (89.8%) with a supportive mean score 4.25 and SD = 0.86, expressed agreement that they are regular in performing every educational activity (formal assessments etc). Most of the teachers (89.3%) with a supportive mean score 4.22 and SD = 0.82, agreed that other teachers’ behavior with the teachers is quite friendly and cheerful in School. Most of the teachers (82.7%) with 4.08 supportive mean score and SD = 0.96, agreed that they received adequate training for professional needs. Most of the teachers (88.9%) with a supportive mean score of 4.19 and SD = 0.86, were in agreement that they are aware of the goals of education. While the majority of the teachers (90.7%) with a supportive mean score 4.24 and SD = 0.83, agreed that they plan their teaching (methods and strategies) to achieve desired objectives. Whereas, the majority of the teachers (91.1%) with 4.24 supportive mean score and SD = 0.76, agreed that they use classroom management skills effectively. The overall majority (89%) of teachers claimed that they perform better management and organization of the classroom.

Table 10 Teaching and learning

| Construct                                      | SA f (%) | AG f (%) | UN f (%) | DA f (%) | SDA f (%) | Total f (%) | Mean | SD  |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------|-----|
| 7. I have command over subject that I teach.   | 101       | 104      | 7        | 10       | 3         | 225         | 4.29 | .84 |
|                                               | 44.9%    | 46.2%    | 3.1%     | 4.4%     | 1.3%      | 100%        |      |     |
Table 10 reflects that most of the teachers (91.1%) with supportive mean score 4.29 and SD = 0.84, were in agreement that they have command over subject matter. Most of teachers (86.6%) with supportive mean score 4.20 and SD = 0.88, were in agreement that they have command over language of instruction. Most of the teachers (88.9%) with supportive mean score 4.26 and SD = 0.88, expressed agreement that they keep the classroom environment helpful for learning. Majority of the teachers (73.4%) with favoring mean score 3.8 and SD = 1.1, showed agreement that they have the right equipment (A.V AIDS) to do their job. While most of the teachers (89.8%) with supportive mean score 4.23 and SD = 0.90, expressed agreement that they demonstrate and present subject matter attractively and effectively. Whereas, majority of teachers (84%) with supportive mean score 4.36 and SD = 0.77, were in agreement that they explain the lesson with daily life examples. Overall majority (86%) of teachers focused on teaching and learning.

Table 11 Support to children and school culture

| Construct                                         | SA (f %) | AG (f %) | UN (f %) | DA (f %) | SDA (f %) | Total (f %) | Mean  | SD  |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------|-----|
| 13. I try to improve work habit and attitude of students. | 117 52%  | 94 41.8% | 6 2.8%  | 3 1.3%  | 5 2.2%   | 225 100%    | 4.40  | .80 |
| 14. I show friendly and enthusiastic behavior with students. | 112 49.8% | 89 39.6% | 14 6.2% | 5 2.2%  | 5 2.2%   | 225 100%    | 4.32  | .86 |
| 15. I give extra time to slow learners to compete to the brilliant students. | 85 37.8% | 100 44.4% | 21 9.3% | 14 6.2% | 5 2.2% | 225 100%    | 4.09  | .96 |
| 16. I am open to students’ ideas and inputs. | 114 50.7% | 95 42.2% | 5 2.2% | 5 2.2% | 6 2.7% | 225 100%    | 4.36  | .856 |
| 17. I develop the communication skills of students by using activity methods. | 88 39.1% | 117 52% | 9 4.0% | 6 2.7% | 5 2.2% | 225 100%    | 4.23  | .83 |
| 18. I discuss with students about classroom problems. | 84 37.3% | 113 50.2% | 16 7.1% | 5 2.2% | 7 3.1% | 225 100%    | 4.16  | .89 |
Table 11 depicts that most of the teachers (93.8%) with majority mean score 4.40 and SD = 0.80, were in agreement that they try to improve work habit and attitude of students. Most of the teachers (89.4%) with majority mean score 4.32 and SD = 0.86, expressed agreement that they show friendly and enthusiastic behavior with students. Most of the teachers (82.2%) with majority mean score 4.09 and SD = 0.96, were in agreement that they give extra time to slow learners to compete to the brilliant students. Majority of teachers (92.9%) with majority mean score 3.46 and SD = 0.86, showed agreement that they are open to students’ ideas and inputs. While majority of the teachers (91.9%) with majority mean score 4.23 and SD = 0.83, were in agreement that they develop the communication skills of students by using activity methods. Whereas, many of the teachers (87.5%) with majority mean score 4.16 and SD = 0.89, were in agreement that they discuss with students about classroom problems. Overall majority (90%) of teachers claimed that they support to children and school culture.

**Teachers’ Performance Level**

Teachers’ performance was categorized according to the criteria as mean score = less than 2.5 = poor, mean score = 2.5 – 3 = satisfactory, mean score = 3.01 – 3.5 = Good, mean score = 3.51 – 4 = very good and mean score = 4.01 – 5 = Excellent.

Table 12 Teachers Performance levels

| Level      | Range     | Frequency | Percent | Weighted mean | SD  |
|------------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----|
| Excellent  | 4.01 – 5  | 156       | 69.3%   | 4.54          | 0.85|
| Very good  | 3.51 – 4  | 50        | 22.2%   |               |     |
| Good       | 3.01 – 3.5| 8         | 3.6%    | 4.54          | 0.85|
| Satisfactory | 2.5 – 3 | 7         | 3.1%    |               |     |
| Poor       | >2.5      | 4         | 1.8%    |               |     |
| Total      | 225       | 100.0%    |         |               |     |

Table 12 reflects that majority (69.3%) of the teachers showed excellent level, 22.2% showed very good level, 3.6% showed satisfactory level and 1.8% showed poor level with mean score 4.54 and SD = 0.85 of teachers’ performance in their self-reported evaluation. Overall majority of teachers’ performance level was excellent or very good.

Table 13 Relationship between performance of teachers’ school heads’ instructional supervisory practices

| Variables             | Mean | SD  | Pearson correlation (r) | p-value |
|-----------------------|------|-----|-------------------------|---------|
| Head Teachers’ supervisory practices | 77.9 | 9.5 | .934                    | .000    |
| Teachers’ Performance | 75.9 | 10.9|                        |         |

N=225

Table 13 reflects that head teachers’ supervisory practices (mean = 77.9 & 9.5) and teachers’ performance (mean = 75.9 & SD = 10.9) were significantly correlated as Pearson r = .934 and p-value = 0.000 < 0.05. The relationship is positive and very strong. It is reflected that if Head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices increases their teachers’ performance also increases.

**Conclusions & Discussion**

Conclusions drawn from the data analysis are as under:

1. School heads’ instructional supervisory practices were “good” in the aspects of collaboration and inspection, leadership skills, professional development, oversight responsibility, assistance and support, and hindrances.
2. Overall levels of School heads’ instructional supervisory practices were very good and excellent.

3. Overall performance of teachers was very good or excellent. They perform better for management and organization of classroom, focus on teaching and learning and support to children and school culture.

4. A positive and significant relationship between school heads’ instructional supervisory practices and performance of the teachers was found. This conclusion is in line with the conclusion of Jared (2009) who found that instructional supervisory practices of ‘head teachers’ have a significant association with performance of teachers.

**Recommendations**

It is found that a considerable number of head teachers’ instructional practices were not at very good level and similarly many of the teachers’ performance was also not at good level so, it is recommended that In-services training may be arranged for teachers and also for school heads by the Training Wing of School Education Department.
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