

# Principal Pedagogical Supervision and Its Influence on School Effectiveness in Some Selected Secondary Schools in Limbe Sub-Division

Njonje Joane Nalova

Curriculum and Evaluation, University of Yaounde I, Yaounde, Cameroon

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0038>

Received: 22 December 2025; Accepted: 28 December 2025; Published: 22 January 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between principal pedagogical supervision and school effectiveness in secondary schools in Limbe Sub-Division. A cross-sectional quantitative survey designed was adopted to gather data from both principals and teachers. Thereby allowing for the analysis of relationships between variables at a single point in time. Data were collected from a sample of 13 principals and 688 teachers. The study explores how different dimensions of supervisory practice (instructional coaching, classroom observation, feedback, mentoring) implemented by principals influence indicators of school effectiveness (teacher professionalism, student outcomes, school climate). Quantitative analyses (descriptive statistics, correlation, and multiple regression) were employed to test hypotheses. The findings indicate a positive and statistically significant relationship between principal pedagogical supervision and school effectiveness. In particular, regular classroom observation and structured feedback strongly predict higher teacher efficiency and improved school climate. Based on the results, the study recommends capacity building for principals, institutionalization of regular supervision frameworks, and policy interventions to support ongoing pedagogical leadership or guidance.

**Keywords:** principal supervision, pedagogical supervision, teachers, school effectiveness

## INTRODUCTION

Effective school leadership is widely recognized as a key driver of school success (Leithwood, Seashore, Anderson and Wohistrom 2004; Fonkeng, and Tamajong 2012). Among principals' leadership practices in school, pedagogical or instructional supervision is particularly important because it directly affects the fundamental business of schools which is teaching and learning. Principals' dynamics involvement in supervising pedagogy has been linked to teacher development, motivation, and ultimately, improved student outcomes. However, in many contexts, supervision remains inconsistent, thereby limiting its potential for enhancing school effectiveness. Recent research has further emphasized the importance of pedagogical leadership. For example, some studies in Nigeria found that principals supervisory practices significantly predicted teacher productivity in secondary schools (Akinfolarin, Babalola, and Aladetan, 2017; Onyali, and Akinfolarin, 2017). In another recent investigation, it was revealed that principals' instructional leadership practices strongly predicted teacher pedagogic and professional competence in secondary schools (He, Guo, and Abazie, 2024; Siahaan, 2024).

Despite these advances above, there remain critical gaps in our understanding of: How principals in secondary schools operationalize pedagogical supervision in daily practice? Which supervisory behaviors are most strongly associated with school effectiveness? And what obstacles limit the impact of supervision? This study is out to address these questions, by surveying both principals and teachers in secondary schools to assess the nature and impact of pedagogical supervision.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### Pedagogical Supervision

- Pedagogical supervision refers to the process by which school leaders engage in the guidance, monitoring, mentoring and development of teachers. Also, principal supervision directly influences teacher

pedagogic capability, this is manifested through structured feedback and ongoing guidance Maryati (2024). Instructional leadership theory postulates that effective principals create conditions for learning by focusing on curriculum, instruction, assessment, and teacher development in their instructional practices (Tambo, 2012; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2014; Musau, L. M. 2024).

Within this framework, key supervisory practices include:

Classroom observation – principals regularly visit classrooms to observe teaching.

Professional development facilitation- principals organized or encourage training based on instructional needs.

Feedbacks and coaching – principals provide constructive feedbacks, mentor teachers, and guide improvements.

Collaborative planning and mentoring - principals support teacher collaboration (e.g, peer observation, co – teaching).

## School Effectiveness

School effectiveness is operationalized as the degree to which a school achieves its educational goals. For this study, school effectiveness is measured in:

**Teacher effectiveness:** Professionalism, pedagogical competence, job satisfaction.

**Student outcome:** In this study, student-level data is not collected directly, it uses teachers and principals' perception of academic performance, classrooms engagement and learning environment.

**School climate:** In this study, school climate is the overall working environment, trust, collaboration and shared vision.

## CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study is situated in secondary schools (e.g., public and private) within the Limbe Municipality in Fako Division. In this setting, principals often wield significant influence over teaching quality, yet they may lack structured supervision frameworks. The national educational policy emphasizes leadership development, but implementation varies widely.

Globally, supervision has been linked to improved teacher performance as stated by (Inungu, Kagema, and Gachahi, 2019). They found that in Kenya principal supervision of teaching positively correlated with students' academic performance. Similarly, in Indonesia, systematic principal supervision has been shown to enhance teachers' pedagogical competence, lesson planning, and class management. On the other hand, contexts with weak or irregular supervisory practices often report under-utilized potential of pedagogical leadership (for example, limited time, lack of training).

By focusing on both principals and teachers in secondary schools, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how pedagogical supervision is practiced and how it translates into school effectiveness.

## Problem Statement

While literature highlights the importance of pedagogical supervision, there is a lack of empirical studies in many educational contexts that directly assess how principals' supervisory actions correlate with measurable indicators of schools. In addition, principals may not be adequately trained in supervision, limiting the depth and quality of their pedagogical engagement. The frequency and nature of supervision can vary widely, resulting in inconsistent teacher support. Teachers may perceive supervision differently, and their views are often underrepresented.

The mechanisms by which supervisory practices translate into school improvement remain underexplored.

Without severe examination of these dynamics, educational stakeholders risk missing opportunities to strengthen school leadership practices and, ultimately, school performance. This gap is particularly pressing in secondary schools, where the stakes for student outcomes and teacher professionalism are high.

## **Research Questions**

1. What are the prevailing practices of principals' pedagogical supervision in secondary schools (as perceived by principals and teachers)?
2. What is the relationship between principals' pedagogical supervision and school effectiveness?
3. What challenges do principals and teachers report in implementing pedagogical supervision?

## **Objectives of the Study**

1. To identify and describe the practices of principals' pedagogical supervision in secondary school.
2. To examine the correlation between principals' pedagogical supervision and indicators of school effectiveness.
3. To explore the challenges faced by principals and teachers in the process of pedagogical supervision.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

A cross-sectional quantitative survey design was adopted to gather data from both principals and teachers, allowing for the analysis of relationships between variables at a single point in time.

### **Population and Sample**

**Population:** All secondary school principals and teachers in Limbe Municipality.

**Sample:** The purposive sampling was applied for principals and stratified random sampling for teachers.

**Principals:** 13 principals were selected purposively to ensure representation of the municipality.

**Teachers:** 688 teachers were randomly selected, they were proportionally stratified by schools and subject departments to reflect the teacher population.

### **Data Collection Instrument**

Two structured questionnaires were developed for the study:

**Principals Pedagogical Supervision Questionnaire (PPSQ):** This questionnaire was constructed to measure how often and in what ways principals supervise pedagogically (observation frequency, feedback, mentoring, coaching).

### **School Effectiveness Questionnaire (SEQ)**

This questionnaire was constructed, to measures perceptions of school effectiveness. Which were, teacher professionalism, school climate, and perceived student outcomes.

Items of the questionnaire were constructed to used Likert-scale responses (1=Never to 5= very Often).

Before the main study, the two instruments were pilot-tested on a small sample (2 principals and 30 teachers) to assess reliability (Cronbach's alpha target = 0.70).

## **Data Collection Procedure**

In the Municipality before the study, the researcher, obtained permission from the educational authority and the different school administrations.

Principals and teachers were informed about the study's purpose and permission was given.

Questionnaires were distributed in physical form to principals and teachers and collected after two weeks.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data (means and standard deviations) that is, to describe supervisory practices and school effectiveness levels.

Pearson correlation analysis was used to test relationships between variables. Multiple regression analysis was used to identify which supervision dimensions predict school effectiveness.

### **Analysis of Results**

**Table 4.1: Supervision Practices - Principals' Perceptions**

<b>Supervision Practice</b>	Mean (M)	Stand (SD)
Classroom Observations	3.8	0.9
Feedback sessions	3.6	1.0
Mentoring/Coaching	3.4	1.1

Findings from table 4.1 indicate that, principals are perceived to frequently engage in supervision under classroom observations ( $M = 3.8$ ,  $SD = 0.9$ ), indicating a relatively strong and consistent practice. Also the findings indicate that Principals frequently hold feedback sessions after supervision ( $M = 3.6$ ,  $SD = 1.0$ ), indicating a relatively strong and consistent practice. And it also indicates that, principals' supervision under Mentoring/Coaching is moderate, with a mean score of 3.4 ( $SD = 1.1$ ). This suggests that while principals generally engage in mentoring/coaching during supervision, there is variability in the frequency and consistency of these practices.

**Table 4.2: Supervision Practices - Teachers' Perceptions**

<b>Supervision Practice</b>	Mean (M)	Stand (SD)
<b>Classroom visit</b>	3.5	0.9
Feedback	3.3	1.0
Mentoring	3.2	1.2

Findings from table 4.2 indicate that teachers are of the opinion that, principals are perceived to frequently engage in supervision during classroom visit ( $M = 3.5$ ,  $SD = 0.9$ ), indicating a relatively strong and consistent practice. Also the findings indicate that teachers are of the opinion that principals frequently hold feedback sessions after supervision ( $M = 3.3$ ,  $SD = 1.0$ ), indicating a relatively strong and consistent practice. And it indicates that, teachers are of the opinion that principals' supervision under mentoring/coaching is moderate, with a mean score of 3.2 ( $SD = 1.1$ ). This suggests that while principals generally engage in mentoring/coaching during supervision, there is variability in the frequency and consistency of these practices.

**Table 4. 3 : School Effectiveness :**

<b>School Effectiveness</b>	Mean M	Stand (SD)
Professionalism	3.5	0.9
School climate	3.3	1.0
Perceived student	3.7	0.9
outcome		

From table 4.3, the findings indicate that professionalism improves school effectiveness ( $M = 3.5$ ,  $SD = 0.9$ ), indicating a relatively strong relationship. Also the findings indicate that school climate improves school effectiveness ( $M = 3.3$ ,  $SD = 1.0$ ) indicating a relatively moderate too strong relationship. And it also indicates that perceived student outcome improves school effectiveness ( $M = 3.7$ ,  $SD = 0.9$ ) indicating a relatively strong relationship.

**Table 4.4: Correlation Analysis between Pedagogical Supervision and School Effectiveness**

#### **A Significant Positive Correlation**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>p</b>
Overall pedagogical supervision (principals) and school effectiveness (teachers).	.58	< .01
Classroom observations and school effectiveness.	.52	< .01
Feedback/Coaching and school effectiveness.	.47	< .01
Mentoring and school effectiveness.	.41	< .01

From table 4.4, the findings indicate that there is a strong positive correlation between the overall pedagogical supervision by (principals) and school effectiveness (teachers) with a correlation coefficient of  $r = .58$  and a p-value of  $< .01$  which is statistically significant. Also, the findings reveal that there is a strong positive correlation between observations and school effectiveness with a correlation coefficient of  $r = .52$  and a p-value of  $< .01$  which is statistically significant. The finding equally reveal that there is a moderate positive correlation between feedback/coaching and school effectiveness, with a correlation coefficient of  $r = .47$  and a p-value of  $< .01$  which is statistically significant. And the findings indicate that, there is a moderate positive correlation between feedback/coaching and school effectiveness, with a correlation coefficient of  $r = .41$  and a p-value of  $< .01$  which is statistically significant

#### **Regression Analysis**

A multiple regression model was constructed with supervision dimensions (observation, feedback, mentoring) as independent variables, and school effectiveness (aggregate) as the dependent variable.

The model was statistically significant ( $F_{3, 684} = 45.2$ ,  $p < .001$ ), explaining about 28% of the variance in school effectiveness ( $R^2 = .28$ ).

Standardized beta coefficients:

Observation  $\beta = .35$  ( $p < .001$ )

Feedback/ coaching  $\beta = .29$  ( $p < .001$ )

Mentoring  $\beta = .18$  ( $p < .001$ )

This shows that classroom observation by principals is the strongest predictor to perceived school effectiveness, followed by feedback/ coaching, then mentoring

## **DISCUSSION**

The finding of this study collaborates and extend prior research on instructional leadership and school effectiveness. The positive correlation and predictive power of supervisory practice is in accord with the works of He, Guo and Abazie (2024), who showed that instructional leadership by principals predicts teacher professional development in secondary schools. Moreover, the predictive importance of classroom observations echoes the theoretical premises of instructional leadership, where direct engagement in teaching processes enable principals to guide pedagogy effectiveness.

It was discovered from the findings that, feedback/coaching is a significant predictor and this is supported by the work of Glickman et al.'s (2014) model of developmental supervision, where structured feedback fosters

teacher growth. Meanwhile, mentoring, though it was considered less strongly predictive, but it also contributes meaningfully to this research, by emphasizing the value of ongoing, relational support during the instructional process. However, the challenges identified in this study such as (time, training, resistance) reflect persistent obstacles in the real-world implementation. These are consistent with existing literature showing that principals often lack capacity or institutional support to carry out supervision systematically. For instance, a review on principal's effectiveness in academic supervision in secondary education found that limited resources and time hinder effective academic supervision Siahaan, (2024).

From the results, it was discovered that, there is a significant, moderately strong positive relationship between principals' frequent supervisory activities to teachers in their classrooms and teachers greater effectiveness. Therefore, there was a significant positive correlation between principal pedagogical supervision and school effectiveness. This is also supported by the review of Awe, B.A., Tilije, R.N., Fatimayin, F. and Adeyemi, V.O. (2022) on principals' supervisory practices and teachers' output in schools and the works of Irungu, C., Kagera, J., & Gachahi, M. (2019 supervision of teaching and its influence on students' performance

As an overall, the study revealed that while pedagogically supervision is being practiced to a moderate degree, its effectiveness could be amplified through international institutional structures, capacity building, and some school culture changes.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the above findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

### **Professional development for principals**

The government should organize regular training workshops on effective supervisory techniques (observation, coaching, mentoring).

Peer- learning networks should be established among principals, so that they can share their best practices and challenges.

### **Institutionalizing supervision framework**

Institutions under the supervision of their principals should develop former supervision schedules (e.g., monthly classroom observation) that should be integrated into their school calendar.

Institution under the control of their principals should create tools (checklists, observation rubrics) which will permit principals to standardize supervision practice.

### **Fostering a feedback culture**

Provide training to principals on how to give developmental feedback after supervision so as to promote a non-threatening, growth-oriented approach.

Principals should encourage collaborative feedback: incorporate teachers' self- reflection, peer observation, and joint analysis of lessons.

### **Resource Allocation**

Technology should be encouraged (e.g., digital observation tools, video recording) to make supervision more efficient.

### **Monitoring and Continuous improvement**

Principals should use data from supervision (observation notes, feedback) to inform school development planning.

## CONCLUSION

This study provides empirical evidence that principal pedagogical supervision significantly influences school effectiveness in secondary school. Classroom observation emerged as the most influential predictor, followed by feedback/coaching and mentoring. While supervisory practices are present, several barriers such as time constraints, lack of training, and inadequate institutional framework turned to limit their full potential. Addressing these challenges through targeted professional development structured supervision systems, and a supportive feedback culture can reinforce pedagogical leadership and ultimately, improve school effectiveness.

## REFERENCE

1. Akinfolarin, C. A., Babalola, C. A. & Aladetan, F. I. (2017). Academic supervision as a correlate of students' academic performance in secondary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 4 (1), 8-
2. Awe, B.A., Tilije, R.N., Fatimayin, F.,and Adeyemi,V.O. (2022). Principals' supervisory practices and teachers' productivity in public secondary schools'. *Science Journal of Education*, 10(3), 118-126.
3. Berhanu, K. Z (2025). The relationship between principals' pedagogical leadership practices and teacher's job performance; the role of sociodemographic characteristics. *BMC Psychology*, 13(89).
4. Fonkeng, G. & Tamajong, E. V. (2012). *Secondary school administration and principal ship* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Yaounde: Press Universitaires d'Afrique.
5. Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, (2014). *The Basic Guide to Supervision and Instructional Leadership*. New York. Pearson.
6. He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9(63).
7. Irungu, C., Kagera, J., & Gachahi, M. (2019). Principals' supervision of teaching and its influence on promoting learners' performance. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 1(1), 33–44.
8. Leithwood, K., Seashore, S., Anderson, K., & Wahstrom. (2004). How Leadership Influences Student Learning. (Review of research).
9. Maryati, Y. (2024). The influence of Principal's Supervision on the Pedagogic Competence of Teachers. *PPSDP International Journal of Education*, 3 (2).
10. Musau, L. M. (2024). An analysis of instructional supervision in forecasting the academic achievement of high school learners in Kenya. *IJNRD*, 9(11).
11. Onyali, L. C. & Akinfolarin, A. V. (2017). Principals' application of instructional leadership practices for secondary school effectiveness in Oyo State. *Journal of Nigerian Academy of Education JONAED*, 13(1), 31-44.
12. Owoyale-Abdulganiy, I. S., & Bibire, H. A. (2022). Principals' supervision and secondary school Islamic Studies students' academic performance in Ilorin East, Kwara State, Nigeria. *Sapientia Foundation Journal of Education, Sciences and Gender Studies*, 4(1).
13. Siahaan, S. (2024). The effectiveness of principal's academic supervision in enhancing teachers' pedagogical competency: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Education*.
14. Tambo, L. (2012). *Principles and Methods of Teaching: Application in Cameroon Schools* (2<sup>rd</sup> ed.)University of Buea: ANUCAM Publisher, Yaunde.