



# Principals' Instructional Supervisory Practices and Teachers' Performance in Secondary Schools in Buea Municipality, South West Region of Cameroon

Njouny Monjong Emmanuel

Department of Educational Foundations and Administration, Faculty of Education, University of Buea

## ABSTRACT

*This study examined the influence of principals' instructional supervision practices on teachers' performance in secondary schools within the Buea Municipality of the South West Region of Cameroon. A descriptive survey research design was adopted, involving a target population of 119 teachers. Using random sampling techniques, a total of 80 secondary school teachers participated in the study. Data were collected through a closed-ended Likert scale questionnaire and analysed descriptively using SPSS version 25. The Spearman's rho test was employed to test the study's hypotheses. Findings revealed a strong, significant, and positive relationship between principals' classroom visitation and teachers' performance ( $r = 0.804$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ). Similarly, a strong positive and significant relationship was found between principals' checking of records and teachers' performance ( $r = 0.811$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ), supervision of lesson preparation and teachers' performance ( $r = 0.787$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ), as well as between principals' demonstration and teachers' performance ( $r = 0.754$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ). The study concluded that effective instructional supervision by principals significantly enhances teachers' performance. It was recommended that principals should hold pre-lesson meetings with teachers, conduct post-lesson visits to assess students' understanding, engage teachers in proper record-keeping practices, and collaboratively set instructional standards to improve teaching and learning outcomes.*

## ARTICLE'S INFO

Article No.: 052826077

Type: Research

Full Text: [PDF](#), [PHP](#), [HTML](#), [EPUB](#), [MP3](#)

DOI: [10.15580/gjah.2026.1.052826077](https://doi.org/10.15580/gjah.2026.1.052826077)

Accepted: 29/05/2026

Published: 01/06/2026

**Keywords:** instructional supervision, principals, teachers' performance, classroom visitation, lesson preparation, Buea Municipality.

### \*Corresponding Author

Njouny Monjong Emmanuel

Department of Educational Foundations and Administration, Faculty of Education, University of Buea

**E-mail:** [njouny.emmanuel@ubuea.com](mailto:njouny.emmanuel@ubuea.com), [njounyemma@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:njounyemma@yahoo.co.uk)

### Article's QR code



## INTRODUCTION

Effective instructional supervision by school principals is widely recognised as a fundamental component of quality teaching and learning in secondary education (Sunaryo, 2023). Principals, acting as instructional leaders, engage in classroom visitation, monitoring lesson preparation, reviewing teachers' records and modelling instructional practices that facilitate teacher growth and student success (Siahaan, 2025). In many sub-Saharan African contexts, including Cameroon, secondary schools continue to report challenges in teacher effectiveness and student outcomes despite reforms and supervision initiatives. These institutions often employ supervision practices, but the link between such practices and teachers' performance remains under-explored in the Cameroonian setting.

The role of the principal in instructional supervision encompasses activities such as observing teaching, providing feedback, checking lesson plans and records, and demonstrating effective instructional strategies (Timona, Ndanu & Kimotho, 2024). Empirical reviews show that structured and continuous supervision by principals is positively associated with enhanced teacher performance and pedagogical competence (Triana, 2025; Herlina, 2023). Further, studies suggest that when supervision includes components like demonstration and collaborative lesson preparation, teachers demonstrate improved planning, classroom management, and instructional delivery (Siahaan, 2025).

In Cameroon's Buea Municipality, the secondary education sector is characterised by increased responsibilities on principals to oversee teaching and learning, manage instructional resources and support teacher professional development. Yet, the extent to which specific supervisory practices, such as classroom visitation, checking of teachers' records, supervision of lesson preparation and demonstration of teaching, impact teachers' performance in these schools remains unclear. Addressing this gap is crucial for informing policy and leadership practices aimed at enhancing teacher effectiveness and improving educational outcomes in the region.

Accordingly, this study seeks to examine the influence of principals' instructional supervision practices on teachers' performance in secondary schools in Buea Municipality. Specifically, it investigates how four key supervisory practices; classroom visitation, checking of teachers' records, supervision of lesson preparation, and demonstration of effective teaching, are associated with teachers' performance. The findings aim to provide evidence-based insights for school principals, educational administrators and policymakers in Cameroon and similar contexts.

### Situating the Study with Existing Literature

Instructional supervision has long been recognised as a key component of educational leadership and school

effectiveness. It serves as a mechanism through which school principals guide, support, and monitor teachers to improve instructional quality and enhance learners' outcomes (Arop, 2020; Mbua, 2023). In recent decades, the concept has evolved from a fault-finding activity to a collaborative process that encourages professional growth, reflective teaching, and continuous improvement (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2018). Within this context, effective instructional supervision is viewed not merely as administrative oversight, but as an essential leadership function that fosters accountability, innovation, and excellence in teaching.

The literature on instructional supervision emphasises its importance in promoting teachers' professional development, ensuring curriculum implementation, and enhancing classroom instruction (Mwambo & Biaka, 2022). Principals, as instructional leaders, are expected to create supportive environments that facilitate effective teaching and learning. This includes classroom visitation, lesson observation, checking of records, and conducting demonstration lessons, all of which are aimed at improving teachers' pedagogical practices and learner achievement (Herlina, Arafat, & Mahasir, 2023).

In the Cameroonian secondary education system, principals play a dual role as administrators and instructional leaders. They are responsible for overseeing curriculum delivery, monitoring teachers' performance, and ensuring that educational standards set by the Ministry of Secondary Education are maintained (Tambo, 2014; Mbua, 2023). However, despite the emphasis on supervision in educational policy frameworks, empirical evidence from local contexts such as Buea Municipality remains limited. This section therefore reviews relevant theoretical and empirical studies that explain how principals' instructional supervision practices—particularly classroom visitation, checking of teachers' records, supervision of lesson preparation, and demonstration—affect teachers' performance.

### Evolution from Inspection to Development

Historically, supervision was rooted in a concept of **inspection**, where school administrators acted as inspectors who monitored teachers' adherence to rules and curriculum requirements. This traditional, top-down approach was often authoritative and judgmental, creating a climate of fear and resistance among teaching staff (Sullivan & Glanz, 2013). This model viewed the teacher as a passive recipient of orders, which has largely been abandoned in progressive educational systems.

In contrast, modern educational philosophy has shifted supervision towards a developmental and clinical approach. This newer model is collaborative, democratic, and centred on the teacher's individual needs and strengths (Glickman et al., 2018). The supervisor acts as a facilitator or mentor, engaging the teacher in cycles of

lesson observation, data analysis, and reflective dialogue. This developmental perspective means that supervision is now viewed as an ongoing, continuous process rather than a one-off performance appraisal.

### **Instructional Supervision as Instructional Leadership**

In contemporary educational administration, the term instructional supervision is often used interchangeably with instructional leadership. Educational Leadership scholars assert that the most effective principals are those who focus their administrative efforts on pedagogy and curriculum, rather than solely on managerial duties like timetables or finance (Sergiovanni, 2016). When a principal dedicates time to observation and providing constructive, curriculum-based feedback, they are performing instructional leadership. This involves establishing a clear vision for learning, managing the school's instructional programme, and promoting a positive professional culture where continuous improvement is the norm. Therefore, a principal's success is judged not just by their administrative efficiency, but crucially by their ability to lead and supervise instruction effectively.

Instructional supervision is a core component of educational leadership, focused on improving the quality of teaching and learning through systematic support, monitoring and feedback (Ngweli & Okumbe, 2017). As Hallinger and Murphy (1985) argue, instructional supervision shifts the principal's role from mere administrator to instructional leader who guides pedagogic improvement within the school. This involves classroom observation, discussion of practice, lesson plan review, and professional development activities (Mitchem & Young, 1999). Research has shown that effective supervision is positively correlated with teacher performance, instructional quality and student achievement (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2014). In the Cameroonian context, Mbua (2023) found that supervisory practices remain underutilised, contributing to persistent lapses in instructional delivery and academic outcomes. Instructional supervision thus remains a crucial lever for enhancing teaching quality and sustaining school improvement.

### **The Role of Principals as Instructional Leaders**

Principals' roles have evolved considerably over the past decades from primarily administrative managers to central instructional leaders charged with improving teaching and learning (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Instructional leadership involves activities that are directly concerned with the quality of teaching and the conditions that support effective instruction, such as setting a clear educational vision, supervising classroom practice, facilitating teacher professional development and ensuring the curriculum is implemented faithfully (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2018). In sum,

principals who enact instructional leadership focus their time and resources on promoting practices that raise teacher effectiveness and pupil outcomes.

Empirical syntheses have shown that leadership that is instructional in nature has measurable benefits for teachers and learners. Robinson et al. (2008) meta-analysis, for example, identified instructional leadership, particularly practices that directly influence teaching and teachers' professional learning as one of the most important influences on student outcomes. Their analysis emphasises that principals' work in shaping curriculum implementation, observing classroom practice and providing feedback is more strongly linked to improved outcomes than many other leadership activities. Timperley et al. (2007) likewise stress that school leaders who prioritise teacher learning and provide high-quality feedback and support create conditions for sustained improvements in classroom practice.

Instructional leadership is enacted through a set of observable practices. Classroom visitation and lesson observation allow principals to gather first-hand evidence of instructional quality and to offer targeted feedback (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Glickman et al., 2018). Checking teachers' records (lesson plans, schemes of work and assessment records) is another routine supervisory practice that both signals accountability and supports instructional coherence (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Supervision of lesson preparation through pre-lesson meetings and collaborative planning, helps align teacher practice with curriculum expectations and supports weaker teachers in adopting effective strategies (Timperley et al., 2007). Demonstration lessons and modelling by the principal or expert teachers provide concrete exemplars and reduce uncertainty about pedagogical approaches (Glickman et al., 2018).

Context matters. In low-resource settings, principals' instructional leadership can be constrained by administrative overload, large class sizes and lack of professional development opportunities (Bush, 2011). Studies from sub-Saharan Africa note that when principals are able to prioritise instructional tasks; despite resource limitations, teacher practice and school effectiveness improve (Leithwood et al., 2004; Mwambo & Biaka, 2022).

The mechanisms linking principals' instructional actions to teacher performance are both direct and indirect. Direct mechanisms include observation and feedback, modelling of practice, and collaborative planning—each of which provides teachers with actionable guidance and strengthens instructional routines (Robinson et al., 2008; Glickman et al., 2018). Indirect mechanisms operate through creating a professional culture: leaders who foster collegiality, encourage reflective practice and provide resources strengthen teacher efficacy and motivation, which in turn influence performance (Leithwood et al., 2004; Timperley et al., 2007). Consequently, effective instructional leadership is both a set of specific supervisory acts (visitation, records checking, lesson preparation supervision, demonstration) and a broader leadership

orientation that places pedagogy at the heart of school activity.

Given this evidence base, examining discrete supervisory practices—classroom visitation, checking of records, supervision of lesson preparation and demonstration—is warranted in contexts such as the Buea Municipality. Disaggregating these practices allows researchers and policymakers to identify which specific leadership actions are most strongly associated with teacher performance in Cameroonian secondary schools and to design targeted interventions to strengthen principals' instructional leadership capacity.

In Cameroon's secondary education system, the school principal occupies a pivotal position in both management and instruction. According to Bahtilla and Hui (2020), the principal in Cameroon must act as a "curriculum-instructional leader" to ensure effective implementation of curricula in secondary schools. Indeed, Mbua's (2023) study in Buea found a significant relationship between principals' instructional leadership practices and teachers' perceptions of supervision effectiveness. Principals' responsibilities include coordinating curricula, supervising lesson delivery, providing feedback and fostering professional growth among teachers (Fonkeng & Tamajong, 2009). Despite this, several studies note that many principals lack sufficient training in supervision and focus instead on administrative duties (Nwana, 1982; Tambo, 2003). According to Nwankwo (1982), school records and supervision are weak links in the Cameroon system, impacting teachers' accountability and performance. The Handbook for Heads of Secondary Schools (MINEDUC, 1996) emphasises the pedagogic function of the principal, yet practice often lags behind policy. In the Manyu and Buea municipalities, supervisory visits and lesson preparation monitoring by principals have been highlighted as key influences on teacher performance (Mwambo & Biaka, 2022). This underscores the importance of the principal's instructional leadership role in navigating the complexities of teacher supervision within Cameroon's context.

### **Instructional Supervision and Teacher Performance**

An extensive body of research demonstrates the impact of instructional supervision on teacher performance. Instructional supervision has consistently been linked to improvements in teacher performance, defined as the effectiveness with which teachers plan, deliver, assess, and reflect on instruction (Comighud, et al., 2021). Teacher performance is not simply time spent teaching, but a multidimensional construct that includes preparation of lessons, use of appropriate teaching strategies, classroom management, assessment practices, and professional commitment (Febrina, et al., 2024). Teacher performance is complex and multifaceted, generally defined as the execution of professional duties that contribute directly to the realisation of educational goals (Robinson et al., 2008). It, therefore, moves beyond mere presence in the

classroom to encompass the quality of instructional delivery, professional commitment, and capacity for growth. Accordingly, instructional supervision serves as a mechanism through which school leaders can influence these dimensions of teacher performance.

In the context of educational research, teacher performance is typically broken down into three measurable components:

1. **Instructional Effectiveness:** This involves the teacher's skill in planning lessons, delivering content using diverse pedagogical strategies, managing the classroom environment effectively, and assessing student learning (Glickman et al., 2018). High instructional effectiveness is marked by the teacher's ability to engage students actively and differentiate instruction.
2. **Professional Development and Growth:** Performance is also measured by the teacher's willingness and ability to adopt new skills, participate in professional learning (Timperley et al., 2007), and reflect critically on their own practice (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). This relates to the concept of teacher efficacy, that is, the belief in one's own ability to influence student learning.
3. **Adherence to Professional Standards:** This component relates to compliance with school policies, national curriculum standards, and the ethical expectations set by the administration (Mbua, 2003).

Numerous quantitative studies report strong positive correlations between supervision practices and teacher performance. For example, Mount Kenya University researchers found that in the Wakiso District (Uganda), there was a statistically significant positive relationship between instructional supervision and teacher performance in secondary schools ( $r = 0.842$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) (Abuko & Andala, 2024). The authors attribute this to increased frequency of classroom observation, document checking and feedback sessions. Similarly, in Indonesia, Singerin (2023) demonstrated that academic supervision had a significant effect on teacher performance ( $t = 4.344$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and that teacher self-efficacy moderated this effect. These results reinforce the idea that supervision is more impactful when it combines structured observation with follow-up support.

Teacher performance improves through various supervisory actions. For example, supervision of lesson preparation helps teachers align their lessons with curriculum standards and adopt evidence-based instructional strategies (Comighud et al., 2021). Classroom visitation allows principals to observe real-time teaching, provide feedback, and model best practice, all of which strengthen teacher expertise (Febrina et al., 2024). Checking teachers' records—such as lesson plans, schemes of work and assessment records—encourages accountability and ensures instructional coherence, thereby enhancing performance (Abuko & Andala, 2024). Demonstration lessons by the

principal or expert teachers serve as live models, reducing uncertainty and enabling weaker teachers to adopt better practices, which again elevates teacher performance (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007).

Despite these positive findings, context-specific factors influence the efficacy of instructional supervision. In many sub-Saharan African contexts, resource constraints, high teacher-student ratios, weak supervisory infrastructure and low technological support hinder full realisation of supervision's potential (Leithwood et al., 2004; Mwambo & Biaka, 2022). In Cameroon, studies indicate that although principals hold instructional leadership roles, many are overloaded with administrative duties and lack adequate training in supervision, which limits their impact on teacher performance (Fonkeng & Tamajong, 2009; Mbua, 2003). Without addressing these contextual barriers, supervisory practices may fail to translate into sustained improvements in teacher performance.

In sum, the literature suggests that instructional supervision is a key driver of teacher performance, particularly when supervision is regular, systematic, participatory and includes follow-up feedback and professional development.

### Statement of the Problem

Effective teaching is widely recognised as a cornerstone of student learning and overall school performance. In secondary schools, teachers' performance significantly influences learners' academic outcomes and the quality of education delivered (Mwambo & Biaka, 2022). Principals, as instructional leaders, are expected to provide supervision that ensures teachers are adequately supported, monitored, and guided in their professional practice (Robinson, et al., 2008). Instructional supervision, including classroom visitation, checking of teachers' records, supervision of lesson preparation, and demonstration of best practices, has been shown in several contexts to positively impact teacher effectiveness (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2018).

In Cameroon, educational policy documents emphasise the principal's role as an instructional leader tasked with improving teaching quality and learning outcomes (Ministry of National Education [MINEDUC], 1996). Despite these policy directives, empirical evidence indicates that many secondary school principals face challenges in executing instructional supervision effectively. Factors such as administrative overload, limited training in supervisory practices, and inadequate monitoring structures often constrain principals' ability to provide consistent and meaningful guidance to teachers (Mbua, 2003; Fonkeng & Tamajong, 2009). Consequently, there exists a gap between policy expectations and actual practice, which may negatively affect teachers' instructional quality and, ultimately, student achievement.

Although studies have examined instructional supervision and teacher performance in sub-Saharan

Africa (Leithwood, et al, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Mwambo & Biaka, 2022), there is limited empirical research focusing specifically on the Buea Municipality. This gap is particularly significant given the unique socio-cultural and educational context of the South West Region, including challenges related to resource allocation, teacher workload, and professional development opportunities. Without clear evidence on how principals' instructional supervision practices influence teacher performance in this context, it remains difficult for policymakers and school leaders to design targeted interventions that enhance teaching quality.

Therefore, this study seeks to examine the influence of principals' instructional supervision practices on teachers' performance in secondary schools in the Buea Municipality, South West Region of Cameroon, with a focus on specific supervisory actions: classroom visitation, checking of teachers' records, supervision of lesson preparation, and demonstration of instructional practices. By investigating these relationships, the study aims to provide empirical evidence that can inform policy and practice in the Cameroonian educational

### Objectives of the Study

1. To examine how principals' classroom visitation impacts teachers' performance.
2. To determine how principals' checking of teachers' records affects teachers' performance.
3. To examine how supervision of lesson preparation influences teachers' performance.
4. To determine how principals' demonstration affects teachers' performance.

### METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design. Descriptive surveys are appropriate for collecting data on existing conditions, behaviours, and perceptions, providing a comprehensive overview of the variables under investigation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The design enabled the researcher to examine the influence of principals' instructional supervision practices on teachers' performance in secondary schools within the Buea Municipality.

The target population comprised all secondary school teachers in the Buea Municipality, totalling 119 individuals. A sample of 80 teachers was randomly selected to participate in the study. Random sampling was employed to ensure that each teacher had an equal chance of selection, thereby enhancing the representativeness of the sample and reducing selection bias (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2019).

Data were collected using a structured, closed-ended questionnaire based on a four-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The questionnaire was designed to capture teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional supervision practices, specifically classroom visitation, checking of

teachers' records, supervision of lesson preparation, and demonstration of instructional practices. The instrument was pre-tested for clarity and reliability prior to full administration. The internal consistency of participants was satisfactory for all the variables with the coefficient values ranging from 0.924 to 0.938. The overall coefficient value of the questionnaire is 0.986 which is above the recommended threshold of 0.7. Based on this, it was concluded that the students are consistent in their responses which makes their questionnaire also reliable for the study.

The questionnaires were physically distributed to the selected teachers across the various secondary schools in the Buea Municipality. Participants were given sufficient time to complete the questionnaires, which were then collected by the researcher. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality of responses was assured to encourage honest and unbiased reporting.

Collected data were coded and analysed using SPSS version 25. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were used to summarise participants' responses. To test the hypotheses and examine the strength and direction of relationships between principals' instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance, the Spearman's rho correlation coefficient was employed. This non-parametric test was appropriate given the ordinal nature

of the Likert-scale data and the study's focus on identifying associations between variables.

The demographic information of the respondents was as follows 42.5% of the teachers are male while 57.5% are female. Respondents ages indicated that 22.5% are were below 25 years, 16.3% between 26-30 years, 26.3% between 31-35 years, 15% between 36-40 years and 20% are 40 plus. Respondents had the following working experiences; 27.5% have worked for 2 years, 22.5% have worked for between 3-5 years, 18.8% between 6-8years and 31.3% for 9 years plus.

## FINDINGS

In this section, the findings have been presented considering respondents' responses according to the main variables which are related to the four (04) key determinants of principals' instructional supervision practices, namely classroom visitation, checking of teachers' records, supervision of lesson preparation, and how principals' demonstration, and how these influence teachers' performance.

**Objective One: To examine how principal's classroom visitation impact teachers' performance in secondary schools in the Buea municipality.**

**Table 1: Teachers' opinion on how Principals' classroom visitation influence their performance**

| Statements   | Stretched              |                        |                        |                       | Collapse               |                        |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|  | SA                     | A                      | D                      | SD                    | SA/A                   | D/SD                   |
| The principal pays visit to class during lessons.  | 11<br>(13.8%)          | 39<br>(48.8%)          | 20<br>(25%)            | 10<br>(12.5%)         | 50<br>(62.5%)          | 30<br>(37.5%)          |
| The principal does not inform teachers before visiting class for observation.            | 13<br>(16.35)          | 38<br>(47.5%)          | 16<br>(20%)            | 13<br>(16.3%)         | 51<br>(63.8%)          | 29<br>(36.2%)          |
| The principal records notes during lesson observation.                                   | 13<br>(16.3%)          | 28<br>(35%)            | 24<br>(30%)            | 15<br>(18.8%)         | 41<br>(51.3%)          | 39<br>(48.7%)          |
| There is usually pre-lesson meeting with teachers by principal                           | 22<br>(27.5%)          | 18<br>(22.5%)          | 27<br>(33.8%)          | 13<br>(16.3%)         | 40<br>(50%)            | 40<br>(50%)            |
| The principal provides the teacher with feedback after observation                       | 17<br>(21.3%)          | 27<br>(33.8%)          | 20<br>(25%)            | 16<br>(20%)           | 44<br>(55%)            | 36<br>(45%)            |
| Principal visits classroom after lesson to find out level of understanding of the lesson | 15<br>(18.8%)          | 25<br>(31.3%)          | 30<br>(37.5%)          | 10<br>(12.5%)         | 40<br>(50%)            | 40<br>(50%)            |
| Teachers ensure a separate teaching scheme for each class during supervision.            | 13<br>(16.3%)          | 36<br>(45%)            | 18<br>(22.5%)          | 13<br>(16.3%)         | 49<br>(61.3%)          | 31<br>(36.7%)          |
| <b>Multiple response set</b>   | <b>104<br/>(18.6%)</b> | <b>211<br/>(37.7%)</b> | <b>155<br/>(27.7%)</b> | <b>90<br/>(16.1%)</b> | <b>315<br/>(56.3%)</b> | <b>245<br/>(43.7%)</b> |

The findings, as presented in Table 1, indicate that a substantial proportion of respondents (62.5%) affirmed that principals regularly visit classrooms during lessons. Furthermore, 63.8% of the teachers reported that such visits are typically unannounced, suggesting that principals often conduct spontaneous classroom observations. Slightly more than half of the respondents (52.3%) indicated that principals take notes during lesson observations, implying a structured approach to

supervision and documentation. The results further revealed that respondents were equally divided regarding the occurrence of pre-observation meetings between principals and teachers, with 50% agreeing and 50% disagreeing. This indicates inconsistency in the practice of preparatory consultations prior to classroom visits. Moreover, 55% of the teachers agreed that principals provide feedback following lesson

observations, signifying that post-observation discussions are moderately practised within the schools.

Additionally, half of the respondents (50%) agreed that principals follow up with classroom visits after lessons to assess pupils' level of understanding, while the other half disagreed, suggesting variability in follow-up supervision practices. A majority of 61.3% agreed that teachers maintain separate teaching schemes for each class during supervision, reflecting adherence to proper instructional planning procedures under supervisory guidance.

Overall, the aggregate analysis shows that 56.3% of respondents agreed with statements relating to principals' classroom visitation practices, while 43.7% disagreed. This generally indicates a moderate level of instructional supervision through classroom visitation within secondary schools in the Buea Municipality.

While Table 1 above presents the descriptive statistics of teachers' opinion on how Principals' classroom visitation influences their performance, Table 2 below presents the inferential statistics on the same issue.

**Table 2: Statistical Presentation of the Relationship between Principals' classroom visitation and Teachers' Performance**

| Test           | Statistical parameters | Principals' Classroom Visitation | Teachers' Performance |
|----------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Spearman's rho | R-value                | 1.000                            | 0.804**               |
|                | P-value                | .                                | 0.000                 |
|                | N                      | 80                               | 80                    |

**\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

The results of the Spearman's rho correlation analysis revealed a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship between principals' classroom visitation and teachers' performance ( $r = 0.804$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ). This indicates that as the frequency and quality of principals' classroom visitation increase, teachers' performance also tends to improve correspondingly.

The high correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.804$ ) suggests that principals' active engagement through classroom visits plays an important role in enhancing instructional delivery and promoting professional accountability among teachers. The p-value of 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 significance level, confirms

that this relationship is statistically significant and not due to random chance.

In essence, the finding implies that principals who consistently visit classrooms, observe teaching, and provide constructive feedback positively influence teachers' motivation, instructional effectiveness, and overall job performance within secondary schools in the Buea Municipality.

**Objective Two: To examine how checking of teachers' records affects teachers' performance in secondary schools in the Buea municipality**

**Table 3: Teachers' opinion on how Principals' Checking of Teachers' records influences their performance**

| Statements  | Stretched              |                        |                        |                       | Collapse               |                        |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|   | SA                     | A                      | D                      | SD                    | SA/A                   | D/SD                   |
| The principal holds session with teachers on record keeping in the school.  | 15<br>(18%)            | 30<br>(37.5%)          | 26<br>(32.5%)          | 9<br>(11.3%)          | 45<br>(56.3%)          | 35<br>(43.7%)          |
| The principal checks scheme of work every beginning of the term.  | 17<br>(21.3%)          | 34<br>(42.5%)          | 15<br>(32.5%)          | 9<br>(11.3%)          | 51<br>(63.8%)          | 39<br>(36.2%)          |
| The principal checks teachers' lesson plans every week.   | 18<br>(22.5%)          | 30<br>(37.5%)          | 23<br>(28.8%)          | 9<br>(11.3%)          | 48<br>(60%)            | 32<br>(40%)            |
| Principal facilities the monitoring of lesson plan to ensure that they are well prepared to achieve instructional objectives. | 15<br>(18.8%)          | 32<br>(40%)            | 19<br>(23.8%)          | 14<br>(17.5%)         | 47<br>(58.7%)          | 33<br>(41.3%)          |
| Principal meets with teachers to set standard goods for instructional progress.   | 17<br>(21.3%)          | 27<br>(33.8%)          | 16<br>(20%)            | 20<br>(25%)           | 44<br>(55)             | 36<br>(45%)            |
| The principal checks records of work covered every week.  | 16<br>(20%)            | 27<br>(33.8%)          | 16<br>(20%)            | 20<br>(25%)           | 43<br>(53.7)           | 37<br>(46.3%)          |
| The principal checks teachers' lesson notes weekly.   | 18<br>(22.5%)          | 28<br>(35%)            | 17<br>(21.3%)          | 17<br>(21.3%)         | 46<br>(57.5%)          | 34<br>(41.6%)          |
| <b>Multiple response set</b>  | <b>116<br/>(20.7%)</b> | <b>211<br/>(37.7%)</b> | <b>141<br/>(25.2%)</b> | <b>92<br/>(16.4%)</b> | <b>327<br/>(58.4%)</b> | <b>233<br/>(41.6%)</b> |

The findings presented in Table 3 indicate that a majority of teachers hold positive views regarding principals' engagement in checking instructional records. Specifically, 56.3% of respondents agreed that principals hold sessions with teachers on record keeping within their schools. Furthermore, 63.8% affirmed that principals routinely check schemes of work at the beginning of each term, while 60% reported that principals examine teachers' lesson plans weekly. This suggests that record verification is a regular supervisory practice in most schools within the Buea Municipality.

In addition, 58.7% of the respondents agreed that principals facilitate the monitoring of lesson plans to ensure they are adequately prepared to meet instructional objectives, and 55% agreed that principals meet with teachers to set standards for effective instructional progress. Similarly, 53.7% of the teachers acknowledged that principals check records of work

covered each week, whereas 46.3% disagreed. Moreover, 57.5% of the teachers indicated that principals inspect lesson notes weekly, showing a consistent level of involvement in academic supervision.

Overall, an aggregate of 58.4% of teachers agreed that principals effectively engage in checking teachers' records, compared to 41.6% who disagreed. This demonstrates that record checking is widely recognised as a significant aspect of principals' instructional supervision practices, reflecting their commitment to ensuring effective teaching and learning through systematic documentation and monitoring of teachers' professional activities.

While Table 3 above presents the descriptive statistics of teachers' opinion on how Principals' Checking of Teachers' records influences their performance, Table 4 below presents the inferential statistics on the same issue.

**Table 4: Statistical Presentation of the Relationship between Principals' checking of teachers' records and Teachers' Performance**

| Test           | Statistical parameters | Checking of Teachers' Records | Teachers' Performance |
|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Spearman's rho | R-value                | 1.000                         | 0.811**               |
|                | P-value                | .                             | 0.000                 |
|                | N                      | 80                            | 80                    |

**\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

The results presented in Table 4 reveal a statistically strong and positive relationship between principals' checking of teachers' records and teachers' performance. The Spearman's rho correlation coefficient obtained was  $r = 0.811$ , with a p-value of 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that the relationship is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The positive correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.811^{**}$ ) suggests that as principals intensify their monitoring and checking of teachers' professional records such as schemes of work, lesson plans, and records of work covered, teachers' performance tends to improve

correspondingly. This implies that consistent and systematic record checking serves as an effective supervisory tool that enhances teachers' accountability, lesson preparation, and overall instructional delivery.

In essence, the results demonstrate that principals' active engagement in reviewing teachers' instructional records contributes significantly to the improvement of teaching performance in secondary schools within the Buea Municipality.

**Objective Three: To determine how teachers' lesson preparation affects teachers' performance in secondary schools in the Buea municipality.**

**Table 5: Teachers' opinion on how Principals' monitoring of Teachers' lesson preparation influences their performance**

| Statements  | Stretched              |                        |                        |                       | Collapse               |                        |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|   | SA                     | A                      | D                      | SD                    | SA/A                   | D/SD                   |
| The principal checks teachers' lesson notes very often.   | 13<br>(16.3%)          | 36<br>(45%)            | 24<br>(30%)            | 7<br>(8.8%)           | 49<br>(61.2%)          | 31<br>(28.8%)          |
| The principal develops and maintains teachers' competence through examining their lesson notes. | 16<br>(20%)            | 28<br>(35%)            | 26<br>(32.5%)          | 10<br>(12.5%)         | 44<br>(55)             | 36<br>(45)             |
| The teaching contents are effectively covered when principal check lesson notes of teacher.     | 21<br>(26.3%)          | 26<br>(32.5%)          | 17<br>(21.3%)          | 16<br>(20%)           | 47<br>(58.7%)          | 33<br>(41.3%)          |
| The principal supervised lesson notes of teachers regularly.                                    | 12<br>(15%)            | 30<br>(37.5%)          | 27<br>(33.8%)          | 11<br>(13.8%)         | 42<br>(52.5%)          | 38<br>(47.5%)          |
| The principal checks teachers' notes to see if all teaching aids are used properly.             | 20<br>(25%)            | 23<br>(28.8%)          | 24<br>(30%)            | 13<br>(16.3%)         | 43<br>(53.7%)          | 38<br>(46.3%)          |
| Teachers lesson plan bears clear objectives for each lesson                                     | 15<br>(18.8%)          | 32<br>(40%)            | 24<br>(30%)            | 9<br>(11.3%)          | 47<br>(58.7%)          | 33<br>(41.3%)          |
| The school administration provide the materials teachers need for lesson plan preparation.      | 19<br>(23.8%)          | 29<br>(36.3%)          | 18<br>(22.5%)          | 14<br>(17.5%)         | 48<br>(60%)            | 32<br>(40%)            |
| <b>Multiple response set</b>  | <b>116<br/>(20.7%)</b> | <b>204<br/>(36.4%)</b> | <b>160<br/>(28.6%)</b> | <b>80<br/>(14.3%)</b> | <b>320<br/>(57.1%)</b> | <b>240<br/>(42.9%)</b> |

Table 5 presents respondents' opinions on principals' supervision of teachers' lesson preparation. The findings indicate that the majority (61.2%) of the teachers agreed that principals frequently check lesson notes, suggesting consistent monitoring of teachers' instructional planning. Furthermore, 55% of the respondents agreed that principals enhance and maintain teachers' professional competence through regular examination of lesson notes, while 45% disagreed. This implies that supervisory practices related to lesson note review may contribute to improving teachers' instructional skills.

Additionally, 58.7% of the respondents agreed that teaching content is more effectively covered when principals monitor lesson notes, and 52.5% confirmed that principals regularly supervise teachers' lesson preparation. Likewise, 53.7% of the teachers agreed that principals check lesson notes to ensure appropriate use of teaching aids, while 58.7% reported that teachers'

lesson plans usually contain clearly stated objectives. Finally, 60% of the respondents agreed that school administrations provide the necessary materials to support lesson planning, while 40% disagreed.

Overall, the aggregate analysis revealed that 57.1% of the teachers agreed with the statements related to principals' supervision of lesson preparation, while 42.9% disagreed. This suggests that, in general, principals in the Buea Municipality play an active role in supervising and supporting teachers' lesson preparation, which is a vital component of effective instructional supervision and teacher performance improvement.

While Table 5 above presents the descriptive statistics of teachers' opinion on how principals' monitoring of Teachers' lesson preparation influences their performance, Table 6 below presents the inferential statistics on the same issue.

**Table 6: Statistical Presentation of the Relationship between Principals' monitoring of lesson preparation and Teachers' Performance**

| Test           | Statistical parameters | Teachers' Preparation | lesson | Teachers' Performance |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------|
| Spearman's rho | R-value                | 1.000                 |        | 0.787**               |
|                | P-value                | .                     |        | 0.000                 |
|                | N                      | 80                    |        | 80                    |

**\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

The results of the Spearman's rho correlation analysis revealed a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship between teachers' lesson preparation and teachers' performance ( $r = 0.787^{**}$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ). This implies that as principals increasingly supervise and support teachers in lesson preparation, there is a corresponding improvement in teachers' performance.

The positive correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.787$ ) indicates that effective supervision of lesson planning and preparation contributes positively to teachers' instructional delivery, classroom management, and overall professional output. The significance level ( $p = 0.000$ ) further confirms that this relationship is not due to chance but represents a meaningful association between the two variables.

In practical terms, this finding suggests that when principals consistently ensure that teachers develop detailed and goal-oriented lesson plans, use appropriate teaching aids, and align instructional content with learning objectives, teachers tend to perform better in their instructional responsibilities. Thus, principals' supervision of lesson preparation plays a crucial role in promoting instructional effectiveness and improving educational outcomes in secondary schools within the Buea Municipality.

**Objective Four: To determine how demonstration affects teachers' performance in secondary schools in the Buea municipality.**

**Table 7: Teachers' opinion on how Principals' Demonstration Technique influences their performance**

| Statements   | Stretched              |                        |                      |                       | Collapse               |                        |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|  | SA                     | A                      | D                    | SD                    | SA/A                   | D/SD                   |
| The principal provides time for teaching demonstration.                            | 16<br>(20%)            | 30<br>(37.5%)          | 24<br>(30%)          | 10<br>(12.5%)         | 46<br>(57.5%)          | 43<br>(42.5%)          |
| The principal illustrates use of educational materials.                            | 13<br>(16.3%)          | 28<br>(35%)            | 25<br>(31.3%)        | 14<br>(17.5%)         | 41<br>(51.3%)          | 39<br>(48.7%)          |
| The principal provides less time for demonstration.                                | 14<br>(17.5%)          | 27<br>(33.8%)          | 27<br>(33.8%)        | 12<br>(15%)           | 41<br>(51.3%)          | 39<br>(48.7%)          |
| The principal lacks teaching competence in all subjects in school.                 | 22<br>(27.5%)          | 14<br>(17.5%)          | 27<br>(33.8%)        | 17<br>(21.3%)         | 36<br>(45)             | 44<br>(55%)            |
| Principals' demonstration helps stimulate teachers' growth.                        | 7<br>(8.8%)            | 39<br>(48.8%)          | 19<br>(23.8%)        | 15<br>(18.8%)         | 46<br>(57.4%)          | 34<br>(42.5%)          |
| The principal involves both students and teachers during demonstration.            | 21<br>(26.3%)          | 29<br>(36.3%)          | 16<br>(20%)          | 14<br>(17.5%)         | 50<br>(62.5%)          | 30<br>(37.5%)          |
| The principal demonstrates on the various forms of students' assessment processes. | 14<br>(17.5%)          | 32<br>(40%)            | 19<br>(23.8%)        | 15<br>(18.8%)         | 46<br>(57.4%)          | 34<br>(42.5%)          |
| <b>Multiple response set</b>   | <b>107<br/>(19.1%)</b> | <b>199<br/>(35.5%)</b> | <b>157<br/>(28%)</b> | <b>97<br/>(17.3%)</b> | <b>306<br/>(54.6%)</b> | <b>254<br/>(45.4%)</b> |

As presented in Table 7, the findings revealed that the majority of teachers expressed positive opinions regarding principals' demonstration practices. Specifically, 57.5% of respondents agreed that principals provide time for teaching demonstrations, while 51.3% affirmed that principals illustrate the use of educational materials. However, an equal proportion (51.3%) also

perceived that principals allocate limited time for demonstrations, suggesting variability in implementation.

Furthermore, 45% of teachers agreed that principals lack teaching competence across all subjects, whereas 55% disagreed, indicating that most teachers believe principals possess adequate instructional competence. Additionally, 57.4% of respondents agreed

that principals' demonstrations contribute to stimulating teachers' professional growth, and 62.5% confirmed that principals actively involve both teachers and students during demonstration activities. A further 57.4% agreed that principals demonstrate different forms of student assessment processes, highlighting their active role in modelling effective instructional and evaluative techniques.

Overall, the aggregate result showed that 54.6% of teachers agreed on the effectiveness of principals' demonstration practices, while 45.4% disagreed. This suggests that, although a majority of teachers perceive principals' demonstrations as beneficial to instructional

improvement, there remains a considerable proportion who may not experience these practices consistently. The findings, therefore, imply that principals' demonstration practices are generally effective in enhancing teachers' instructional skills and professional growth, but their application may require greater consistency and depth across schools in the Buea Municipality.

While Table 7 above presents the descriptive statistics of teachers' opinion on how Principals' demonstration techniques influence their performance, Table 8 below presents the inferential statistics on the same issue.

**Table 8:** *Statistical Presentation of the Relationship between Principals' Demonstration and Teachers' Performance*

| Test           | Statistical parameters | Demonstration | Teachers' Performance |
|----------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Spearman's rho | R-value                | 1.000         | 0.754**               |
|                | P-value                | .             | 0.000                 |
|                | N                      | 80            | 80                    |

**\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Statistical Interpretation of the Relationship between Principals' Demonstration and Teachers' Performance  
The results of the Spearman's rho correlation analysis, as presented in Table 8, indicate a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship between principals' demonstration practices and teachers' performance ( $r = 0.754$ ,  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ ). This finding implies that as principals increasingly engage in effective demonstration practices—such as modelling teaching strategies, illustrating the use of instructional materials, and providing feedback—teachers' performance tends to improve correspondingly.

The positive correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.754^{**}$ ) suggests that higher levels of principals' instructional demonstration are associated with enhanced teacher competence, classroom management, and instructional delivery. The significance level ( $p < 0.05$ ) further confirms that this relationship did not occur by chance, indicating a meaningful association between principals' demonstration and teachers' performance in secondary schools within the Buea Municipality.

In summary, the statistical evidence demonstrates that principals who frequently employ demonstration as part of their instructional supervision positively influence teachers' effectiveness and professional development. This underscores the importance of demonstration as an instructional leadership strategy for improving teaching quality and learner outcomes.

## CONCLUSION

Instructional supervision remains one of the most essential responsibilities of school administrators in promoting quality teaching and learning in secondary

schools. The article examined the influence of principals' instructional supervision practices on teachers' performance, with emphasis on areas such as curriculum supervision, classroom observation, feedback to teachers, professional support, and monitoring of instructional activities. From the review of literature and empirical evidence presented, it is evident that effective instructional supervision contributes significantly to improving teachers' pedagogical competence, lesson preparation, classroom management, instructional delivery, and overall professional effectiveness.

The study further revealed that principals who regularly supervise classroom instruction, provide constructive feedback, support professional development, and maintain collaborative relationships with teachers are more likely to enhance teachers' commitment and performance in schools. Instructional supervision was also found to encourage accountability, improve adherence to curriculum objectives, and promote continuous improvement in teaching practices. Conversely, weak supervision practices, inadequate monitoring, limited instructional support, and poor communication between school administrators and teachers negatively affect teachers' effectiveness and students' academic outcomes.

In the context of secondary schools in the Buea Municipality and similar educational settings, instructional leadership and supervision are indispensable tools for ensuring educational quality and school effectiveness. Principals therefore need to adopt supportive, democratic, and developmental supervision approaches that encourage teacher motivation, professional growth, and active participation in school improvement processes.

The study concludes that effective instructional supervision is a strong determinant of teachers'

performance and overall educational success. Consequently, school administrators, educational stakeholders, and policy makers should strengthen supervisory practices through regular training, provision of adequate instructional resources, continuous professional development programmes, and the promotion of collaborative school cultures. Such efforts will contribute greatly to improving teachers' effectiveness, students' academic achievement, and the overall quality of secondary education.

## REFERENCES

- Abuko, R., & Andala, H. O. (2024). Instructional supervision and teacher performance in secondary schools in Wakiso District, Uganda. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 16(1), 45–58.
- Arop, F. O. (2020). Instructional supervision and school effectiveness in secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 4(2), 15–27.
- Bahtilla, M., & Hui, L. (2020). Curriculum leadership and instructional supervision in secondary schools in Cameroon. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(3), 101–110.
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Comighud, S. M., Arevalo, M. J., & Baluyos, G. R. (2021). Instructional supervision and teachers' performance in secondary schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 18(3), 34–45.
- Febrina, D., Sari, M., & Putra, H. (2024). Classroom supervision and teacher performance in contemporary secondary schools. *International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, 11(2), 66–79.
- Fonkeng, G. E., & Tamajong, E. V. (2009). *Secondary school administration and principalship in Cameroon*. Bamenda: Maryland Printers.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.
- Herlina, S. (2023). Principal instructional supervision and teachers' pedagogical competence in secondary education. *Journal of Educational Management Studies*, 7(1), 20–31.
- Herlina, S., Arafat, Y., & Mahasir, M. (2023). Instructional leadership and teachers' pedagogical practices in secondary schools. *International Journal of Educational Review*, 5(2), 88–99.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.
- Mbua, F. N. (2003). *Educational administration: Theory and practice*. Design House.
- Mbua, F. N. (2023). Instructional leadership and supervision effectiveness in secondary schools in Buea Municipality. *Cameroon Journal of Educational Research*, 15(1), 52–67.
- Ministry of National Education (MINEDUC). (1996). *Handbook for heads of secondary schools in Cameroon*. Yaoundé: Author.
- Mitchem, K., & Young, K. (1999). Instructional supervision and professional growth among teachers. *Educational Leadership Review*, 1(1), 43–55.
- Mwambo, M., & Biaka, H. (2022). Principals' supervisory practices and teacher performance in secondary schools in Manyu and Buea municipalities. *African Journal of Educational Studies*, 14(2), 76–91.
- Ngweli, P., & Okumbe, J. A. (2017). Instructional supervision and teacher effectiveness in schools. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 4(6), 125–134.
- Nwana, O. C. (1982). *Educational administration and supervision*. Heinemann Educational Books.
- Nwankwo, J. I. (1982). *Educational administration: Theory and practice*. Bisi and Brothers.
- Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2016). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision: A redefinition* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Siahaan, A. (2025). Instructional supervision and collaborative lesson preparation in secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Supervision and Leadership*, 9(1), 14–29.
- Singerin, S. (2023). Academic supervision, self-efficacy and teacher performance in Indonesian secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Management and Leadership*, 6(3), 55–70.
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2013). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques* (4th ed.). Corwin Press.
- Sunaryo, W. (2023). Effective instructional supervision and quality teaching in secondary education. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 8(2), 40–52.
- Tambo, L. I. (2003). *Education and development in Cameroon*. ANUCAM.
- Tambo, L. I. (2014). *Principles and methods of teaching in Cameroon schools*. ANUCAM.

Timona, M., Ndanu, M., & Kimotho, S. (2024). Principals' instructional supervision practices and teacher effectiveness in secondary schools. *East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 5(1), 90–104.

Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher professional learning and development:*

*Best evidence synthesis iteration (BES)*. Ministry of Education, New Zealand.

Triana, R. (2025). Structured instructional supervision and teacher competence in secondary schools. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 12(1), 33–47.

**Cite this Article:** Njouny, ME (2026). Principals' Instructional Supervisory Practices and Teachers' Performance in Secondary Schools in Buea Municipality, South West Region of Cameroon. *Greener Journal of Art and Humanities*, 11(1): 40-52, <https://doi.org/10.15580/gjah.2026.1.052826077>.