Journal of Elementary Education
June 2023, Volume 33, No. 1, pp. 73-88

Comparison of Instructional Management Practices of Private and Public School Principals

Nadia Saleem[*], Mushtaq Ahmad[**] and Asghar Ali[***]

Abstract

Instructional management is procedure of decision making to start a particular activity for students. The study opted was to compare the instructional management practices of public and private school head teachers. Research questions were (i) What are the instructional management practices of principals in public schools? What are the instructional management practices of principals in private schools? Are instructional management practices of private school principals better than public school principals? Survey method was used for data collection from the population of all the principals of private and public secondary schools of Sargodha Tehsil, a sample of 100 principals 50 out of 192 public (including 25 female and 25 male) and 50 of private secondary schools were selected conveniently. An adapted questionnaire "Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)" by Hallinger, & Wang (2013) open access and permitted was used validated through five Ph.D. experts and pilot tested on 50 principals revealed acceptable Cronbach's Alpha value 0.76. Data collected through self-approach were analyzed through SPSS version 22. Major findings were that majority of the Principals of private schools were using better instructional management practices than the Principals of public schools. It is recommended that Principals of public school may be given training by Directorate of Staff Development to put maximum for instruction to compete the private schools.

Keywords: *Instructional Management Practices & Public and Private Schools.*

[*] Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Lahore College for Women University
[**] Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of Sargodha
[***] Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Malakand

Introduction

Education is an essential determining factor of national development. The quality of human resources is the pivotal element of quality of education. Spending on education reflects an investment for the improvement of human resources. Advanced countries use a lot of funds to provide free education or at minimal cost to the young citizens for the development of the country. Pakistan is investing only 2.8% of GDP in education (Federal Budget, 2020-21, Government of Pakistan). Apart from the expenses, institutional management is more important for the quality of education. According to Tobin, (2014), educational managers have to perform a different function than the managers of any other organization: management of instructions.

Instructional management provides the framework for a principal to make decisions about classroom instructions at any grade level (Wilson, (2012). Moreover, management of instructions is the process of making decisions about the instruction and supervising the progress of the students, the sequence of the lessons, and individual level instruction of teachers (Rahmawati, 2017).

It is the responsibility of school principals to improve the learning environment and observe classroom instructions to provide valid feedback to teachers (Nasatir, 2016). To fulfill this responsibility, principals use classroom walkthrough observations for insight of the instructional process within the school (Kubicek, 2015).

When a principal fully understands the instructional process, he may adjust his practices of management to boost the opportunities for better education for teachers and students. Providing opportunities for professional development and consistency of instructional programs is a way for principals to manage their school's instruction. Principal leadership is affected by the professional community, quality of professional development, and partnerships with parents (Sebastian, Allensworth, & Huang, 2016).

Principals being managers of the instructional program must make out provision for professional development, good quality teaching, through learning opportunities for teachers, clarify instructional objectives, and build curriculum coherence. A constructive change may happen in instructional quality and in overall learning through the efforts of principals within their schools (McCarley, Peters, & Decman, 2014). According to Day et al. (2010), the effective principles of instructional management practice are; (a) State the vision and values to rise expectations, and build trust through setting direction. (b) Redesign the teaching-learning conditions. (c) Reshape leadership responsibilities and Rearrange institutional parts. (d) Enrich the curricular activities. (e) Improve the quality of teachers. (f) Improve the teaching-learning quality. (g) Construct internal collaboration. (h) Develop strong school-community relationships.

In most of the underdeveloped countries, just about 90% of primary level students and 70% of secondary level students get enrolled in public schools (Farooq, Feroze, & Kai, 2017). The government sector is not able to cater the requirement of quality education for fast increasing population in Pakistan also (Asian Development Bank, 2019). That's why students enrollment in private schools is growing day-by-day. In short, both private and public sector schools are involved in provision of education to masses.

Researches conducted in developed and underdeveloped countries revealed that principals of the schools focusing on their role of instructional leaders were helpful to the teachers in using better methodologies to improve the students' educational performance; and maintaining expectations of the extraordinary achievement of students (Johnson, Johnson, Johnson, 2014). The principal is known as a key leader with the responsibility of forming and sustaining the quality of education and school achievement (Marsh & LeFever, 2000). It is also the responsibility of principals to improve teachers' instruction and students' learning (Lashway, 2003).

In the educational field of Pakistan, in recent times the leadership in schools is acknowledged for improvement of qualitative features of education (Mansoor, & Akhtar, 2015). Most of the principals of Pakistani schools lack the necessary instructional leadership skills. In Pakistani schools, this deficiency is because school principals are not given formal training in pedagogy and instruction before appointing them as principal/leader. Therefore, they just focus and strive on administrative matters and do not involve in the pedagogical development of students in the schools. This situation prevails in all Government sector schools, which are the major education providers in Pakistan. There are around 200,000 public sector primary, middle, and secondary schools where principals are doing their duties but do not have any professional training in managing instructions (Khan, 2004). While some private school principals out admirable struggles for academic leadership and to add to the teachers-learning process (Memon, 2000).

Researchers like Estevany, (2012); Khan, (2005), made a comparison between government and private schools in Pakistan and concluded that the quality level of education in private schools was better maintained as compared to public schools. But in this research, the instructional management was not analyzed; they focused on other features, e.g. teachers' salary, students' fee structure, household income, and home–school distance, etc. The principals of private schools have better freedom than their counterparts in government sector schools. This freedom encourages and motivates them to be active to handle the educational, managerial, and social responsibilities (Awan, & Zia, 2015). It is clear that management practices of instructional programs need to be

synchronized with the widespread whole school improvement plan (Leiva, Montecinos, Ahumada, Campos, Guerra, 2017).

According to Day, & Sammons, (2014), different circumstances demotivate or hinder school principals to be involved in a number of facets of instruction. So, it is the obligation of school principals to use instructional management to implement such practices for the development of a shared vision of an effective teaching-learning process, motivation of teachers for sustainable teaching progress, improving classroom instructions and checking teachers' distractions (Leiva, et al, 2017). Practices of managing instructions should be coordinated with the overall plan of school improvement. Hence the study was opted to compare the instructional management practices of private and public school principals.

Research questions

The Research questions of the study were:

1. What are the instructional management practices of principals in public schools?
2. What are the instructional management practices of principals in private schools?
3. Are instructional management practices of private school principals better than public school principals?

Research Methodology

The study was exploratory and a survey technique was used to collect the data from the respondents of the study. Due to a shortage of time, resources, and a large number of potential participants, the study was delimited to Principals of public and private secondary schools in Sargodha Tehsil. So, all the principals of private and public schools were the population of the study. A sample of 100 principals including 50 out of 192 of public including 25 male and 25 female secondary school and 50 out of 150 private secondary schools were selected conveniently on a willing basis. Public schools are co-education schools and no separate Girls school are there.

In this study for data collection, one questionnaire for principals was adapted which was "Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)" developed by Hallinger, & Wang, (2013). The scale is open access and permitted to use for research studies. The questionnaire was discussed with five (05) experts holding Ph.D. Education degree. After incorporating the experts' suggestions, the questionnaire was finalized with twenty nine (29) items. Pilot study was carried out on 50 principals not included in the actual sample. Analyzing data of pilot study, Cronbach's Alpha value calculated was 0.76 which was acceptable. The questionnaire included the item about school type.

The researcher personally visited the private and public schools. The scale was disseminated personally to the samples of the study to collect the responses. The responses were collected on the availability of principals of schools.

The data collected through a questionnaire; were tabulated and analyzed calculating frequencies, percentages, mean scores and standard deviations through 'Statistical Package for the Social Sciences '(SPSS) version 22.

Table 1
Framing the school goals

S #	Statement	School type	N	R	S	O	A	Mean	SD
1.	Develop the school goals in terms of staff responsibilities.	Public	Nil	Nil	2 4 %	23 46 %	25 50 %	4.46	.578
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	27 54 %	23 56 %	4.46	.503
2.	Use needs assessment or other formal and informal meetings to secure staff input on school goals development.	Public	Nil	2 4 %	5 10 %	24 48 %	19 38 %	4.20	.782
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	29 58 %	21 42 %	4.42	.498
3.	Use data of student performance when developing the school's academic goals.	Public	Nil	Nil	7 14 %	24 48 %	19 38 %	4.24	.686
		Private	Nil	Nil	4 8 %	11 22 %	35 70%	4.62	.635
4.	Formulate the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings.	Public	Nil	1 2 %	4 8%	17 34 %	28 56 %	4.44	.732
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	9 18 %	41 82%	4.82	.388

N= Never; R= Rarely; S= Seldom; O = Often & Al = Always

Table 1 indicates that the majority of principals (96%) of public schools with mean score 4.46 and SD=0.578 and almost all principals of private schools (99%) with mean score 4.46 and SD= 0.503 claimed that they always or often develop the school goals with respect to staff duties. Similarly, the majority (86%) of public schools' principals with mean score 4.20 and SD=0.782 and all the principals of private schools (100%) with mean score 4.42 and SD=0.49 claimed that they always or often use needs assessment through informal and formal meetings to acquire staff input on school goal formulation. Likewise, the majority (86%) of public school principals with mean score 4.24 and SD=0.686 and 92% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.62 and SD=0.635 claimed that they always or often use data from student performance for the development of school's academic goals. The majority (90%) of the principals of

public schools with mean score 4.44 and SD= 0.732 and all the principals of private schools (100%) with mean score 4.82 and SD= 0.388 claimed that they always or often formulate the schools' academic goals after meetings with teachers. The majority of the principals of public schools (84%) with mean score 4.38 and SD= 0.923 and all the principals of private schools (100%) with mean score 4.80 and SD= 0.404 claimed that they always or often visit classrooms to discuss school issues with students and teachers.

Table 2

Supervision and evaluation of instructions

S #	Statement	School type	N	R	S	O	A	Mean	SD
5.	Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students.	Public	1 2 %	1 2%	6 12 %	12 24 %	30 60 %	4.38	.923
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	10 20 %	40 80 %	4.80	.404
6	Review student work products when evaluating classroom instructions.	Public	Nil	2 4 %	4 8 %	28 56 %	16 32 %	4.16	.738
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	28 56 %	22 44 %	4.44	.501
7	Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis.	Public	Nil	2 4 %	4 8 %	9 18 %	35 70 %	4.54	.813
		Private	Nil	Nil	1 2 %	26 52 %	23 46 %	4.44	.540
8	Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation for improvement.	Public	Nil	Nil	5 10 %	34 68 %	11 22 %	4.12	.558
		Private	Nil	Nil	2 2 %	41 82 %	7 14 %	4.10	.416
9	Discuss instructional weakness with teachers in post-observation for improvement.	Public	Nil	1 2 %	7 14 %	26 52 %	16 32 %	4.14	.728
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	20 40 %	30 60 %	4.60	.494

N= Never; R= Rarely; S= Seldom; O = Often & Al = Always

Table 2 indicates that the majority of the principals of public schools (88%) with mean score 4.16 and SD= 0.738 and all (100%) the principals of private schools with mean score 4.44 and SD= 0.501 claimed that they always or often review student work while evaluating classroom instruction. The majority of the principals of public schools (88%) with mean score 4.54 and SD= 0.813 and 98% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.44 and SD= 0.540 claimed that they always or often take informal classroom observations regularly. The majority (90%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.12 and SD= 0.558 and 96% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.10 and SD= 0.416 claimed that they always or often indicate particular strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation meetings. The majority of

the principals of public schools (84%) with mean score 4.14 and SD= 0.728 and all the principals of private schools (100%) with mean score 4.60 and SD= 0.494 claimed that they always or often discuss instructional weakness with teachers in post-observation for improvement.

Table 3
Coordinating the syllabus

S #	Statement	School type	N	R	S	O	A	Mean	SD
10	Monitor the classroom syllabus to see the extent to which school's objectives were achieved.	Public	Nil	1 2 %	3 6 %	28 56%	18 36 %	4.26	.664
		Private	Nil	Nil	1 2 %	35 70 %	14 28 %	4.26	.486
11	Assess the link between the learning objectives and the school's achievement tests.	Public	Nil	Nil	12 24 %	33 66 %	5 10 %	3.86	.571
		Private	Nil	Nil	2 4 %	43 86 %	5 10 %	4.06	.373
12	Participate actively in the review of learning materials.	Public	Nil	2 4 %	10 20 %	31 62 %	7 14 %	3.86	.700
		Private	Nil	Nil	3 6 %	40 80 %	7 14 %	4.08	.444
13	Meet with teachers individually to discuss student progress.	Public	Nil	Nil	5 10 %	14 28 %	31 62 %	4.52	.677
		Private	Nil	Nil	3 6 %	18 36 %	29 58 %	4.52	.614
14	Attend extra- and co-curricular activities.	Public	Nil	3 6 %	3 6 %	14 28 %	30 60 %	4.42	.859
		Private	Nil	1 2 %	Nil	5 10 %	44 88 %	4.84	.509

N= Never; R= Rarely; S= Seldom; O = Often & Al = Always

Table 3 indicates that the majority of the principals of public schools (92%) with mean score 4.26 and SD= 0.664 and 98% of the principals of private schools with mean

score 4.26 and SD= 0.486 claimed that they always or often monitor the classroom syllabus to see the extent to which school's objectives were achieved. The majority (76%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 3.86 and SD= 0.571 and 96% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.06 and SD= 0.373 claimed that they always or often consider the links between school's achievement tests and the learning objectives, but a considerable number of principals (24%) of public schools seldom do it. The majority (76%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 3.86 and SD= 0.70 and 94% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.08 and SD= 0.444 claimed that they always or often actively contribute in reviewing learning materials, but a considerable number of principals (20%) of public schools seldom do it. The majority (90%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.52 and SD= 0.677 and 94% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.52 and SD= 0.614 claimed that they always or often conduct individual meetings with teachers to discuss students' progress. The majority (88%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.42 and SD= 0.859 and 98% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.84 and SD= 0.509 claimed that they always or often attend extra- and co-curricular activities.

Table 4
Protecting instructional time

S #	Statement	School type	N	R	S	O	A	Mean	SD
15	Students or teachers are not called to the office during instructional time.	Public	13 26 %	12 24 %	11 22 %	8 16 %	6 12 %	2.64	1.351
		Private	2 4 %	1 2 %	11 22 %	6 12 %	30 60 %	4.22	1.111
16	Ensure that late comer's students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time.	Public	Nil	3 6 %	10 20 %	30 60 %	7 14 %	3.82	.747
		Private	Nil	Nil	1 2 %	41 82 %	8 16 %	4.14	.404
17	Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts.	Public	1 2 %	Nil	11 22 %	28 56 %	10 20 %	3.92	.778
		Private	1 2 %	2 4 %	3 6 %	36 72 %	8 16 %	3.96	.754
18	Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time.	Public	Nil	4 8 %	13 26 %	23 46 %	10 20 %	3.78	.864
		Private	Nil	2 4 %	9 18 %	36 72 %	3 6 %	3.80	.606
19	Manage for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives.	Public	1 2 %	Nil	2 4 %	13 26 %	34 68 %	4.58	.758
		Private	Nil	Nil	2 4 %	16 32 %	32 64 %	4.60	.571

Table 4 indicates that half of the principals of public schools (50%) with mean score 2.64 and SD= 1.351 claimed that they always or often do not call students or

teachers in the office during instructional time, but half of the principals (50%) of public schools seldom do it do it sometime or always and often and 72% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.22 and SD= 1.111 always or often call the teachers or students in office during class time. The majority (74%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 3.82 and SD= 0.747 and 98% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.14 and SD= 0.404 claimed that they always or often ensure that late comer students should face definite penalties for missing instructional time but a considerable number of principals (26%) of public schools seldom or rarely do it. The majority (76%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 3.92 and SD= 0.778 and 88% of the principals of private schools with mean score 3.96 and SD= 0.754 claimed that they always or often motivate teachers for using instructional time for practicing and teaching new concepts and skills, but a considerable number of principals (22%) of public schools seldom do it. A handsome number (66%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 3.78 and SD= 0.864 and 78% of the principals of private schools with mean score 3.80 and SD= 0.606 claimed that they always or often delimit the interruption of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time, but a considerable number of principals (34%) of public schools and 22% principals of private schools seldom or rarely do it. The majority (94%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.58 and SD= 0.758 and 94% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.60 and SD= 0.571 claimed that they always or often manage teachers till the arrival of a substitute teacher.

Table 5
Providing incentives for teachers

S #	Statement	School type	N	R	S	O	A	Mean	SD
20	Reinforce superior performance of teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos.	Public	4 8%	3 6 %	10 20 %	19 38 %	14 28 %	3.72	1.178
		Private	1 2 %	Nil	6 12 %	23 46 %	20 40 %	4.22	.815
21	Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance.	Public	Nil	3 6 %	10 20 %	22 44 %	15 30 %	3.98	.868
		Private	Nil	Nil	9 18 %	31 62 %	10 20 %	4.02	.622
22	Reward special efforts of teachers with opportunities for	Public	Nil	Nil	7 14 %	26 52 %	17 34 %	4.20	.670

professional recognition.	Private	Nil	1 2 %	Nil	21 42 %	28 56 %	4.52	.614

Table 5 indicates that a handsome number (66%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 3.72 and SD= 1.178 and 86% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.22 and SD= 0.815 claimed that they always or often strengthen higher performance of teachers during staff meetings, memos and/or newsletters, but a considerable number of principals (34%) of public schools seldom or rarely or never do it. The majority (74%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 3.98 and SD= 0.868 and 82% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.02 and SD= 0.622 claimed that they always or often praise teachers in private for their performance or efforts, but a considerable number of principals (26%) of public schools seldom or rarely do it. The majority of (86%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.20 and SD= 0.670 and 98% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.52 and SD= 0.614 claimed that they always or often reward distinct efforts of teachers with opportunities for professional growth.

Table 6
Promoting professional development

S #	Statement	School type	N	R	S	O	A	Mean	SD
23	Actively support the use of the classroom skills acquired during in-service training.	Public	Nil	1 2 %	10 20 %	27 54 %	12 24 %	4.00	.728
		Private	Nil	Nil	5 10 %	34 68 %	11 22 %	4.12	.558
24	Lead or attend teacher in-service activities related to instruction.	Public	Nil	1 2 %	10 20 %	35 70 %	4 8 %	3.84	.584
		Private	Nil	Nil	3 6 %	35 70 %	12 24 %	4.18	.522
25	Set a time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information.	Public	Nil	2 4 %	3 6 %	11 22 %	34 68 %	4.54	.787
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	4 8 %	46 92 %	4.92	.274

Table 6 indicates that majority (78%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.00 and SD= 0.728 and all (100%) of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.12 and SD= 0.558 claimed that they always or often actively support the methods or skills used in the classroom, learnt during in-service training, but a considerable number of principals (22%) of public schools seldom or rarely or never do it. The majority (78%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 3.84and SD= 0.584 and 94% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.18 and SD= 0.522 claimed that they always or often lead or show up during teachers' activities related to teaching; but a considerable number of principals (22%) of public schools seldom or rarely do it. The majority (90%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.54 and SD= 0.787 and 94% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.92 and SD= 0.274 claimed that they always or often provide teachers with time during faculty meetings to share information or ideas.

Table 7
Provide incentives for learners

S #	Statement	School type	N	R	S	O	A	Mean	SD
26	Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honor roll or mention on news board.	Public	Nil	2 4 %	3 6 %	27 54 %	18 36 %	4.22	.736
		Private	Nil	2 4 %	Nil	41 82 %	7 14 %	4.06	.549
27	Use assemblies to honor students for academic accomplishments.	Public	Nil	Nil	4 8 %	17 34 %	29 58 %	4.50	.646
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	4 8 %	46 92 %	4.92	.274
28	Contact parents to communicate	Public	Nil	Nil	3 6 %	18 36 %	29 58 %	4.52	.614

	improved student performance.	Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	2 4 %	48 96 %	4.96	.197
29	Support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions in class.	Public	Nil	Nil	3 6 %	24 48 %	23 46 %	4.40	.606
		Private	Nil	Nil	Nil	8 16 %	42 84 %	4.84	.370

Table 7 indicates that the majority (90%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.22 and SD= 0.736 and 96% of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.06 and SD= 0.549 claimed that they always or often identify students of good work with suitable rewards such as mention on news board or an honor roll. Similarly, the majority (92%) principals of private schools with mean score 4.5 and SD= 0.646 and all the principals of private schools (100%) with mean score 4.92 and SD= 0.274 claimed that they always or often announce in assembly to reward students for their academic achievements. The majority (94%) of the principals of public schools with mean score 4.52 and SD= 0.614 and all (100%) the principals of private schools with mean score 4.96 and SD= 0.197 claimed that they always or often contact parents to communicate improved student performance. The majority (94%) of principals of public schools with mean score 4.40 and SD= 0.606 and all (100%) of the principals of private schools with mean score 4.84 and SD= 0.370 claimed that they always or often actively upkeep teachers in acknowledging and/or rewarding student contributions in class.

Table 8

Overall comparison of Instructional management practices of public and private schools Principals

	School Type	Mean	SD	t-value	df	Sig. (p-value)
Overall	Public Schools	120.260	8.14864	-5.698	98	.000
	Private Schools	127.940	4.94216			

Table 8 shows that a significant difference of instructional management practices between principals of public and private schools was found as indicated by t-value= -5.698 with DF= 98 and p-value= 0.000<0.05. The greater mean score (127.940) of private school principals shows better performance than the public school principals (mean score= 120.26).

Table 9

Gender based comparison of Instructional management practices of Principals of public and private schools

Gender	School type	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (p-value)
Male	Public School	122.0800	7.30251	-3.312	49	.002
	Private school	127.5385	4.08148			

Table 9 shows that a significant difference exit between instructional management practices of male principals of public and male principals of private schools was found as indicated by t-value = -3.312 with df = 49 and p-value = 0.02< 0.05. The greater mean score =127.538 shows that male principals of private schools performed better instructional management practices than the male principals of public schools (mean score =122.08). while there was no female principal in private schools.

Conclusions and Discussion

It was concluded that overall private schools' principals show better Instructional management practices as compared to principals of public schools; this is in line with the findings of Shabbir (2014) who conducted a study in Azad Kashmir and concluded that private school principals were performing better than public school principals in maximum measures of performance. The possible reason may be that principals of private school have to consider the parents response on achievements of students; parents remain vigilant as they pay heavy dues for their children while parents of students studying in government school usually don't bother and keep least contact with the school.

The conclusions that Principals of private and public schools are doing better in framing school goals in terms of staff responsibilities; needs assessment and supervising and evaluating instructions are according to the viewpoint of Pont, Nusche & Hopkins (2008) that school leaders have discretion in setting strategic direction and optimize their capacity to develop school plans and goals and monitor progress, using data to improve practice.

Similarly, the conclusion that Principals of private and public schools are doing better in coordinating syllabus to monitor classroom activities to see the extent to which covers the school's objectives is similar to the arguments of Manaseh, (2016) that Heads of schools should actively participate in curriculum coordination in schools and establish goals and strategies focused on enabling teachers to cover the subjects' syllabi on time. The possible reason may be that principals of government schools have to perform many other duties like supervision of polio duties, election duties etc. along with their regular duties so they cannot focus properly on instructional supervision.

Another conclusion that Principals of private and public schools are doing better in protecting the instructional time is similar to the findings of Mestry, (2017) that principals supervise the teachers to devote more time to instructional matters. The possible reason may be that school is run under a set time table and teachers follow that.

The conclusion that Principals of private and public schools are doing better in promoting professional development is according to the argument of Chen, (2018) that teachers' professional development can be improved through principal's instructional supervision. Possible reason may be that teachers are more conscious than principals for their professional development and their good will.

The conclusion that principals of private and public schools are doing better in providing incentives for teachers and students is according to the findings of Meyer, (2017) that providing teachers incentives for praising students increases teachers' willingness to praise students, administrators may find using incentives very valuable. Moreover Dee, & Wyckoff, (2013) also concluded that financial incentives further improved the performance of high-performing teachers. The possible reason may be that in government schools, government incentives policies are followed and in private schools teachers are given incentives to keep them in the school and lessen their switching to better paid schools.

Recommendations

1. Directorate of staff development of the School Education Department may arrange training for the Principals of Public schools to become aware of effective instructional management practices. Whereas owners or governing bodies of private schools also may arrange training or awareness seminars for the principals for instructional management.
2. Chief Executive Officers of the Districts may arrange mutual visits of public and private schools to some outstanding school system institutions e.g. Beacon House schools, City schools, etc. to witness the good level of instructional management practices.

References

Asian Development Bank (2019). *School Education in Pakistan: A Sector Assessment*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22617/TCS190039

Awan, A. G., & Zia, A. (2015). Comparative Analysis of Public and Private Educational Institutions: A case study of District Vehari-Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice, Vol.6*, No.16. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079988.pdf

Chen, C. C. (2018). *Facilitation of Teachers' Professional Development through Principals' Instructional Supervision and Teachers' Knowledge- Management Behaviors*. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.77978

Day, C. J., Moller, D., Nusche & Pont, B. (2008). *The Flemish (Belgian) Approach to System Leadership a case study report for the OECD Improving School Leadership activity.* Retrieved from www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership

Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2014). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust. Retrieved from www.educationdevelopmenttrust.com

Dee, T., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). *Incentives, selection, and teacher performance: evidence from impact*. Working Paper 19529, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w19529

Estevany, F. (2012). *The quality of public education and private school enrollment: an assessment using Brazilian data*. Retrieved from https://www.bu.edu/econ/files/2012/11/dp-185.pdf

Farooq, M. S., Feroze, N. & Kai, Y. T. (2017). Public VS Private Quality Education at Primary Level in Pakistan. *International Online Journal of Primary Education, volume 6*, issue 2. Retrieved from www.iojpe.org

Hallinger, P., & Wang, W.C. (2013). *Measurement properties of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Technical Report, version 4.2. Hong Kong: Asia Pacific Centre for Leadership and Change, Hong Kong Institute of Education

Johnson, W. L., Johnson, A. M., Johnson, J. W. (2014). *Strategies for Improving School Performance*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED552919.pdf

Khan, A. (2012). Instructional management of a private and a government secondary school principal in Northern Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Development, 32*(1), 120-131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.12.003

Kubicek, M. R., (2015). *Principals' Use of Classroom Walkthrough Observations to Improve Instruction: A Grounded Theory*. Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss/209

Lashway, L. (2003b). *The mandate to help low performing schools* (Report No. EDOEA (03-06). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC) Document Reproduction Service No. ED478248). Retrieved from https:// scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/3398/digest169.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1

Leiva, M. V., Montecinos, C., Ahumada, L., Campos, F. Guerra, S. (2017). Novice principals' instructional management practices in high poverty, low performing schools in Chile. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 237*. Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com

Manaseh, A.M. (2016). Instructional leadership: The role of heads of schools in managing the instructional programme. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, *4*(1), 30-47. doi: 10.17583/ijelm.2016.1691

Mansoor, Z., & Akhtar, R. N. (2015). The Paradigm Shift: Leadership Challenges in the Public Sector Schools in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice, Vol.6*, No.19. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079537.pdf

Marsh, D. D. & LeFever, K. (2004). School principals as standards-based educational leaders: Looking across policy contexts. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 32*(4), 387-404. ttps://doi.org/10.1177/1741143204046494

McCarley, T. A., Peters, M. L.. & Decman, J. M. (2014). Transformational leadership related to school climate: a multi-level analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* published online 4 November 2014. DOI: 10.1177/1741143214549966

Mestry, R. (2017). Principals' perspectives and experiences of their instructional leadership functions to enhance learner achievement in public schools. *Journal of Education, Issue 69*. Retrieved from http://joe.ukzn.ac.za

Meyer, K. L. (2017). *Utilizing Incentives to Increase Teacher Praise*. Unpublished *Masters Theses*. 2701. Retrieved from https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2701

Nasatir, S. I., (2016). *The Effects of Consistent Observation and Feedback on Teacher Practice and Motivation to Refine Instruction.* Dissertations. 173. National Louis University. *Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/diss/173*

Pont, B., D. Nusche and Hopkins, D. (eds.), (2008). *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership.* OECD, Paris. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/education/school/44375122.pdf

Rahmawati, W. (2017). *The Instructional Management*. Retrieved from http://pascapbi-3a.blogspot.com/2017/01/the-instructional-management.html

Sebastian, J., Allensworth, A., & Huang, H. (2016). The Role of Teacher Leadership in How Principals Influence Classroom Instruction and Student Learning. *American*

Journal of Education, 123. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED577947.pdf

Shabbir, M. et al. (2014). A Comparative Study of Public versus Private Primary Schools, An Evidence From Azad Kashmir (Pakistan Administrative Kashmir). Journal of Education and Practice, Vol.5, No.9. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234635571.pdf

Staples, C. M. (2005). *A Comparison of the Leadership Roles of Public and Private Elementary School Principals*. Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019. 621. University of Central Florida. Retrieved from https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/621

Tobin, J. (2014). Management and Leadership Issues for School Building Leaders. National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. *NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, Vol. 9*, No. 1; ISSN: 2155-9635. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1024110.pdf

Wilson, N. L., (2012). *The Principal's Role in Developing the Classroom Management Skills of the Novice Elementary Teacher*. PhD dissertation., University of Tennessee, Retrieved from https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/1572