

School Governance and Effective Curriculum Implementation in Secondary Schools in Yaoundé Centre, Cameroon

Author

Genevarius Nji 

Author's email: ngenevarius@gmail.com

University of Bamenda, Cameroon.

Cite this article in APA

Nji, G. (2026). School governance and effective curriculum implementation in secondary schools in Yaoundé Centre, Cameroon. *Journal of education management and leadership*, 5(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.51317/jeml.v5i1.896>



A publication of Editon Consortium Publishing (online)

Article history

Received: 2025-11-27

Accepted: 2025-12-25

Published: 2026-01-28

Scan this QR to read the paper online



Copyright: ©2026 by the author(s). This article is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).



Abstract

The study looks at the relationship between school governance and effective curriculum implementation in secondary schools in Yaoundé. The school principal has the responsibility to organise and channel the limited available resources to enhance quality curriculum implementation. In case he is wanting in this area, institutional objectives would not be met as students' performances would not be optimum and scarce resources would be wasted. Within the context of this study, school governance was limited to principals' leadership and management, stakeholder engagement, accountability and transparency and teacher support and development. The study explored these variables, ascertaining a link to quality curriculum implementation within the context of secondary education. Simple random sampling and proportionate sampling techniques were applied to ensure the selection of representative samples. The Instrument used for data collection was the questionnaire. Spearman's rank correlation was employed to analyse the data. and it was found that principals' leadership and management, stakeholder engagement, accountability and transparency, and teacher support and development significantly determine the quality of curriculum implementation in secondary schools, with correlation coefficients of 0.456, 0.496, 0.614, and 0.742, respectively. Recommendations have been made to the relevant stakeholders based on the research findings.

Key terms: Cameroon, curriculum implementation, school governance, secondary schools, Yaoundé Centre.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

School governance and effective curriculum implementation are fundamental for ensuring quality in pedagogic processes in the education production function. School governance refers to the structures, processes, and practices that guide how a school is managed and how decisions are made, while curriculum implementation involves the translation of curriculum policies and guidelines into classroom practices. School governance has the responsibility to ensure that effective curriculum implementation takes place in the school because it is a salient element in determining student achievement and school internal efficiency. In spite of this, many secondary schools still face challenges as far as implementing curriculum reforms are concerned. This indicates that governance structures are insufficiently supportive of the teaching and learning process. This paper examines the link between school governance and curriculum implementation in secondary schools, with a focus on the variables that influence effective curriculum implementation. This study aims to contribute to the development of strategies to improve school governance and curriculum implementation, thus optimising student learning outcomes in secondary schools.

It has been observed over the past years that students' performances, especially in Cameroon's official examinations, have not been the best. To a certain extent, it could be deduced that curriculum implementation seems to be a major issue, in the sense that teachers seem not to be teaching effectively, and as such, learning could not be effective either. This could be attributed to lapses in pedagogic governance in the sense that if school administrators fail in their task as instructional supervisors, the teaching learning process would equally be found wanting. Lapses in curriculum implementation would prevent the school from achieving institutional objectives, thereby increasing school internal inefficiency. On the other hand, effective school governance could play a crucial role in successful curriculum implementation. School administrators could provide strong leadership support, provide clear guidelines for curriculum implementation, allocate sufficient resources and regularly monitor and evaluate implementation. When these elements are lacking, students' learning and achievements will not be optimised. In particular, this study intends to answer the following research questions: to what extent do principals' leadership and management influence curriculum implementation in secondary schools? How does the stakeholders' engagement affect curriculum implementation in secondary schools? In what ways do accountability and transparency affect curriculum implementation in the secondary school? And how does teacher support and development affect curriculum implementation in the secondary school?

From the questions, the following hypotheses were elaborated: Ha1: Principals' leadership and management influence curriculum implementation in secondary schools; Ha2: There is a relationship between stakeholders' engagement and curriculum implementation in secondary schools; Ha3: Principals' accountability and transparency has an influence on curriculum implementation in the secondary school; Ha4: There is a significant relationship between teacher support and development and curriculum implementation in the secondary school.

In pursuit of the answers to research questions, the following research objectives were raised: this study sets out to assess the extent to which principals leadership and management influence curriculum implementation in secondary schools; to study effects of stakeholders' engagement on curriculum implementation in secondary schools; to investigate the ways in which principals' accountability and transparency affect curriculum implementation in the secondary school; and to examine teacher support

and development affect curriculum implementation in the secondary school. This study's results will provide insight into:

Understanding the relationship between school governance and curriculum implementation: This study could contribute to the understanding of how school governance structures and processes impact the effective implementation of curriculum in secondary schools. The findings of this study could inform and refine theoretical models of school governance and curriculum implementation, providing a deeper understanding of the complex interactions between these variables.

The study's findings could inform policymakers and school administrators on how to improve school governance structures and processes to support effective curriculum implementation. The study could identify strategies to support teachers in implementing the curriculum effectively, leading to improved student outcomes. The study's findings could inform policy and practice related to school governance and curriculum implementation, leading to better resource optimisation.

By exploring the relationship between school governance and curriculum implementation, this study could identify strategies to improve teaching and learning in secondary schools. Findings from this research may inform approaches to boost student achievement and support social-emotional development. The study could identify areas where teachers may need additional support or professional development to effectively implement the curriculum.

By exploring the relationship between school governance and curriculum implementation, this study could contribute to improving the quality of education in secondary schools. Findings from this research may inform approaches that promote inclusive education and equal opportunities for underrepresented or disadvantaged students. The study's findings could inform strategies to support societal development by ensuring that secondary education is relevant, effective, and aligned with societal needs.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

School governance and curriculum implementation are widely acknowledged as critical determinants of educational quality and equity in all societies. Governance structures are responsible for defining how authority, responsibility, accountability and transparency are shared among stakeholders such as Parents and Teachers Association, School principals, Teachers, Parents, and Government agencies. Curriculum implementation could be seen as a process of translating curriculum policy into classroom practices through the teaching and learning transaction (Fullan, 2007). School governance encompasses the structures, procedures, and practices that direct a school's management and decision-making. It equally involves the distribution of authority and responsibility among stakeholders, including school administrators, teachers, parents, students, and the broader community.

Leithwood et al. (2020) argue that in most cases, even well-designed curricula fail to achieve intended outcomes when governance structures are not efficient enough. This literature review focuses on conceptual, theoretical, and empirical studies on school governance and curriculum implementation, with a specific focus on secondary school education.

Concept of School Governance

School governance refers to the formal and informal arrangements through which schools are directed, controlled, and held accountable for achieving educational goals (OECD, 2016). It includes policy formulation, decision-making processes, leadership practices, and stakeholder participation in school affairs (Bush, 2011). Governance structures may vary across education systems, ranging from centralised, bureaucratic control to decentralised, school-based management models.

According to Caldwell (2005), effective school governance promotes shared decision-making, transparency, and accountability, thereby creating conditions that support teaching and learning. Similarly, UNESCO (2017) emphasises that governance frameworks shape how schools interpret and implement curriculum policies. In secondary schools, governance bodies such as school boards or governing councils play a crucial role in approving instructional programs, allocating resources, and monitoring curriculum delivery.

Models of School Governance

Centralised Governance

In centralised governance systems, such as those in Cameroon, curriculum decisions are largely made by centralised authorities within the Ministry of Education. Even though this approach ensures uniformity and standardisation, it hampers school-level autonomy and responsiveness to local needs (Carnoy, 2014). Studies have shown that rigid centralised control can constrain teachers' ability to adapt curriculum content to learners' contexts, particularly in diverse secondary school environments (Fullan, 2007).

Decentralised and School-Based Management

In Decentralised governance, decision-making is transferred to school authorities and their governing bodies. Caldwell and Spinks (2013) suggest that decentralised governance can enhance curriculum implementation by increasing stakeholder ownership and accountability. However, the effectiveness of decentralisation depends heavily on the capacity of school leaders and governing bodies to understand curriculum requirements and support instructional practices (OECD, 2016).

Curriculum Implementation in Secondary Schools

According to Lakhe (2025), curriculum implementation is the phase of putting the prescribed curriculum into action in the classrooms. The availability of adequate and trained human and material resources is the essence for the successful implementation of curricula. Curriculum development involves four key stages: needs assessment, planning and design, implementation, and evaluation. The successful execution of a curriculum depends on the availability of sufficient and well-trained human and material resources.

The curriculum as a learning tool is prepared and made by the government, as a guide in the implementation of learning regarding the objectives, content, and learning materials, as well as the methods used as guidelines for organising learning activities in order to achieve national education goals (Lubis, 2020; Ansori, 2020; Nuraeni & Irawan, 2021). One of the problems faced in the curriculum implementation process begins with the teacher's lack of understanding, especially in mastering the material presented and demands to complete the material according to the specified time (Dohlen & Karvonen, 2018; Lähdesmäki & Maunula, 2022). Many teachers complain that they cannot explore the methods used, so they only use the lecture method to deliver material (Sasmito et al., 2020; Fauzan et al., 2022). This is evident in Cameroon, where competence-based teaching is recommended, but many factors

prevent teachers from adequately implementing it. The second issue is that many curriculum programs have not been implemented, including ICT-based learning development programs, which are supposed to occur every two weeks. The third issue is the inadequacy of facilities, including delayed textbook deliveries that hinder learning and frequent internet disruptions during online lessons.

Curriculum implementation refers to the actual delivery of educational content, activities, and assessments as outlined in the curriculum framework. Effective curriculum implementation requires: Teacher training, Resource allocation and Monitoring and evaluation. School managers need support and professional development to deliver the curriculum effectively. School leadership's provision of adequate resources, including materials, technology, and infrastructure, is necessary to support curriculum implementation. Effective and consistent assessment and evaluation help identify areas for improvement and ensure that the curriculum meets its intended goals.

Effective Strategies for Curriculum Implementation

According to Lundeberg and Levin (2003), teachers' understanding and interpretation of the curriculum are shaped by their own knowledge and experiences. The curriculum includes at least four essential components: the educational goals to be attained; the knowledge, information, skills, activities, and experiences drawn from various sources; the teaching and guidance methods used to help students achieve the intended goals; and methods of assessment used in measuring and assessing the results of the educational process designed in the curriculum (Hasanah, 2019).

Curriculum implementation involves translating curriculum documents into instructional practices through lesson planning, teaching strategies, assessment, and evaluation (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018). In secondary schools, implementation is particularly complex based on learner differences and limited access to didactic materials. For Marsh and Willis (2007), successful curriculum implementation requires teacher quality, adequacy in instructional materials, administrative support for teachers, and continuous professional growth. Governance instruments may influence each of these factors by defining funding priorities, instructional supervision practices, and accountability and transparency systems.

Influence of School Governance on Curriculum Implementation

Role of School Governing Bodies

School governing bodies, whether in centralised or decentralised systems, play a salient role in curriculum implementation through resource mobilisation and support for instructional programs. Bush and Glover (2014) stressed that governing bodies that understand curriculum policies are better positioned to support teachers and monitor curriculum implementation adequately. Conversely, Caldwell and Spinks (2013) emphasised that a lack of training among school governors often hampers contributive efforts to effective curriculum implementation in secondary schools.

Role of the Principal

The school principal, as a leader, functions as a bridge between governance structures and curriculum implementation through effective classroom practice. Hallinger (2011) and Leithwood et al. (2020) show that principals who prioritise instructional leadership and supervision positively influence curriculum implementation through classroom visitation and coaching, teacher mentoring, and data-driven decision-making. In contrast, principals overwhelmed by administrative tasks tend to provide limited curriculum support. The principal is also the custodian of school properties and is expected to provide adequate

facilities to enhance effective teaching and learning. Didactic materials are supposed to be adequately available in school. Bahtilla and Xu (2020) stated that the vital roles of principals as curriculum-instructional leaders include: communicating the vision and mission of the school, using assessment data to improve teaching and learning, monitoring and evaluating teaching and learning, providing professional development programs for teachers, and creating and enforcing policies that prioritise teaching and learning. School leader have the responsibility to creating a stimulating environment that can enhance teaching and learning, making sure that teachers have adequate tools, and resources required for effective curriculum implementation, ensuring effective communication between principals, teachers and otherstakeholders involved in curriculum implementation to ensure that the curriculum is effectively implemented; motivating and encourage teachers to effectively implement the curriculum; setting realistic rules and regulations to ensure the success of the implementation process.

Walker et al. (2011) argue that failure to effectively implement curriculum reforms can be attributed to principals' inability to serve as curriculum-instructional leaders. Similarly, Mitchell and Castle (2005) stressed that some principals do not fully know what they are supposed to do as instructional leaders. A school principal who performs only managerial functions is not different from managers in any other organisation (Bahtilla & Xu, 2020). Most often, Secondary school principals do not have much time to ensure effective implementation of the curriculum and see themselves more often as general managers.

Empirical research from both developed and developing countries underscores the link between governance and curriculum implementation. For example, studies in Sub-Saharan Africa reveal that weak school governance contributes to poor curriculum delivery due to limited resources, inadequate supervision, and insufficient leadership capacity (Ngware et al., 2019). Similarly, research in OECD countries highlights that schools with strong governance frameworks and leadership capacity are more successful in implementing curriculum reforms (OECD, 2016).

Arif et al. (2020) carried out a study on the interactive effect of school principals' leadership styles and teacher characteristics on curriculum implementation at public secondary schools of Punjab and found that both teaching characteristics (traditional and progressive) mediate between leadership styles and curriculum implementation; and that Commanding and visionary styles become more effective with the mediation of teacher characteristics. The democratic and visionary school principals are better disposed to fostering teacher leadership by fostering a culture of mutual understanding, responsibility, and initiative, whereas the commanding leadership is restricted to close supervision, a lack of freedom, and the use of innovative practices to manage immediate deadlines efficiently.

Matowo and Tenha (2023) found that the lack of a strong financial base in rural schools greatly affected the effective implementation of the new curriculum, and that the availability of material resources is an important element in schools. Their unavailability affects the effective implementation of the curriculum. They continue to emphasise that qualified and specialised teachers have an impact on how teaching and learning take place in schools; it is crucial that such teachers are available in schools for effective teaching and learning across all subject areas.

Despite extensive research, many gaps remain. First of all, many studies focus on school leadership with limited attention to collective governance structures. Secondly, there is a lack of longitudinal studies examining how variations in governance affect curriculum implementation over time. Thirdly, few studies

integrate governance theory and curriculum implementation frameworks into a single analytical model, especially in secondary school contexts.

The literature reviewed indicates that school governance plays a predominant role in shaping the quality of curriculum implementation in secondary schools. Effective governance structures promote leadership, transparency, accountability, stakeholder engagement, and resource allocation, all of which are salient for successful curriculum implementation in secondary schools. In contrast, weak governance undermines curriculum implementation despite policy quality. This review, however, provides a basis for further empirical investigation into how governance practices can be strengthened to optimise curriculum implementation.

Theoretical Framework

Systems Theory

Systems theory views schools as complex systems composed of interrelated subsystems, including governance, curriculum, teaching, and assessment (Banathy, 1991). From this perspective, ineffective governance distorts system coherence, leading to lapses in curriculum implementation. To solve this problem, Governance structures must align with policies, resources, and pedagogical practices to achieve curriculum objectives.

The school principal's leadership style and management practices are critical in influencing teacher motivation and commitment to curriculum implementation, as teachers need consistent support and development to implement the curriculum effectively. This could be through mentoring, training, and coaching. Education stakeholders, such as parents and the community, need to be included in the implementation of the curriculum. They have to be involved in key decision-making processes. The school needs to establish clear accountability and transparency mechanisms to ensure that teachers are held accountable during the curriculum implementation process.

Instructional Leadership Theory

Instructional leadership theory emphasises the role of school leaders, particularly principals, in guiding curriculum implementation (Hallinger, 2011). Principals are expected to supervise instruction, support teachers, and ensure alignment between curriculum objectives and classroom practices. Leithwood et al. (2020) opined that strong instructional leadership could positively determine curriculum implementation and student performance in secondary schools.

This theory emphasises the role of principals as instructional leaders who promote teaching and learning. Principals can use their leadership and management practices to enhance a supportive environment that optimises teacher development and student learning. This includes providing teachers with the resources and support they need to deliver the curriculum effectively. Principals, as instructional leaders, can oversee and assess how effectively the curriculum is implemented, making adjustments when necessary. This includes providing feedback to teachers and pinpointing areas that require improvement.

Policy Implementation Theory

This theory explains how education policies and curriculum reforms are interpreted and enacted at the school level (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1984). The theory focuses on the fact that curriculum implementation outcomes are shaped by governance instruments, clarity of policy goals, availability of scarce resources,

and stakeholder engagements. With Poor governance, curriculum intentions are often diluted during implementation, and, as a result, educational objectives are not met (Fullan, 2007). The policy implementation theory focuses on the importance of well-designed policies that are clear, specific, and achievable. In the context of school governance, policies should be designed to support effective curriculum implementation and student learning. The Theory highlights the importance of the implementation process in determining the success of policies. In schools, the implementation process involves teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders working together to implement the curriculum and achieve organisational goals. The importance of stakeholder engagement in the policy implementation process cannot be underestimated. In schools, stakeholders include teachers, administrators, parents, and the community.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out in selected secondary schools in Yaoundé centre. The research design adopted for this study is the quantitative approach. The data collection instrument was the questionnaire.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items	N of Items
.768	.770	28

The reliability analysis was conducted on a 28-item questionnaire designed for school governance. The results indicate excellent internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.768, suggesting that the items are highly reliable and consistently measure the variables under investigation. Using simple random sampling and snowball sampling, a sample of 224 teachers was selected for the study. The Yamane formula was utilised in determining the sample size, which considers both the population size and the acceptable margin of error. This sample size provides a reasonable balance between precision and practicality, allowing for reliable estimates of population parameters. The various schools were selected using a simple random sampling technique, whereas the sample elements were chosen through a snowball sampling method. Quantitative data was analysed using Spearman's rank correlation because the data collected was ordinal data with natural ranking, and the data was not normally distributed. In order to ensure beneficence, confidentiality and anonymity, participants were informed about the objective, risks, and benefits of the study through a participant information sheet and provided their written consent before participating. All data were kept confidential and anonymous, and participants' identities were protected. The researcher implemented all necessary measures to reduce potential risks and safeguard the participants' well-being.

4.0 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Background Information

Items	Modalities	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	98	43.75
	Female	126	56.25
Age	20-30 years	108	48.21
	31-40 years	78	34.82
	41 years and above	38	16.96
Working Experience	0-10 years	115	51.33
	11-20 years	68	30.35
	21 years and above	41	18.30
Professional Qualifications	DIPES /DIPET I	130	58.03
	DIPES/DIPET II	94	41.96

The respondents came from various backgrounds. More than 50 per cent of them were females, and the majority of them were not more than 30 years old. More than 50 per cent of respondents have been teaching for between 0 and 10 years. All respondents were trained and were holders of either a DIPES/DIPET I or DIPES/DIPET II from teacher training colleges.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics on Principals' Leadership and Management

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Principals demonstrate proper Leadership and management skills.	224	1.00	4.00	1.0714	1.21437
Principals' leadership style provides clear direction, support and guidance to teachers and staff.	224	1.00	4.00	2.4464	1.24446
Decision-making processes are transparent, inclusive, and data-driven.	224	1.00	4.00	3.0313	.94888
School management is effective in implementing policies, managing resources, and maintaining a positive school culture.	224	1.00	4.00	2.6027	1.04095
Principals carry out pedagogic supervision activities regularly	224	1.00	4.00	2.3839	1.15790
Professional development activities are regularly carried out.	224	1.00	4.00	3.1786	1.00861
Valid N (listwise)	224				

In the first item, respondents agreed (mean=1.0714) that Principals demonstrate proper Leadership and management skills in their administration. However, this demonstration fails to provide clarity on direction, support, and guidance to teachers and staff in general, as seen in the second item. This means that principals' leadership and management skills in secondary schools are wanting in planning, leading, organising, coordinating, budgeting, and orienting school resources to meet salient objectives. In the third item, respondents disagreed (mean =3.0313) that decision-making processes are transparent, inclusive, and data-driven. This means that team spirit is lacking among school actors, which can adversely affect

curriculum implementation, as the attainment of pedagogic objectives requires effective collaboration. Lack of collaboration through teaming and consultation would render school management ineffective in implementing policies, managing resources, and maintaining a positive school culture. Respondents disagreed (mean= 2.3839) that supervision activities are regularly carried out. They also disagreed (mean = 3.1786) that professional development activities are regularly carried out. This prevents teachers from acquiring new, important skills which could help them optimise the teaching quality.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics on Stakeholders' Engagement

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Teacher management is meticulously carried out to enhance effective teaming and collaboration among staff.	223	1.00	4.00	2.8879	1.30522
Parents and other stakeholders are actively involved in students' pedagogic follow-up through regular updates, meetings and volunteer opportunities.	223	1.00	4.00	2.7982	1.10266
Students are involved in curriculum implementation and development processes to ensure that the curriculum is relevant and engaging.	223	1.00	4.00	2.6143	1.06296
There is clarity and regularity in reporting and communication to stakeholders, including parents, students, and the broader community.	223	1.00	4.00	2.5067	1.14242
School management provides opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback and input on curriculum implementation.	223	1.00	4.00	3.2125	.05845
Valid N (listwise)	223				

Stakeholder engagement in education is the process of involving various individuals and groups in decision-making processes and activities that affect educational institutions. In the first item, teachers disagreed (mean=2.8879) that teacher management is meticulously carried out to enhance effective teaming and collaboration among staff. This explains why curriculum implementation could be wanting at all levels. Secondly, parents and other stakeholders are not (mean=2.7982) actively involved in students' pedagogic follow-up through regular updates, meetings and volunteer opportunities. Respondents disagreed (mean=2.6143) that students are involved in curriculum implementation and development processes to ensure that the curriculum is relevant and engaging. Respondents disagreed (mean=2.5067) that there is clarity and regularity in reporting and communication to stakeholders, including parents, students, and the broader community. In the last item, respondents disagreed (mean=3.2125) that school management provides opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback and inputs on curriculum implementation. From the data above, it could be concluded that school governance is not participatory as it does not involve key stakeholders.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics on Accountability and Transparency

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Teacher evaluation is regularly carried out to determine teacher commitment.	223	1.00	4.00	2.7489	1.26622
The regularity and effectiveness of monitoring and evaluating school performance, including student achievement and teacher effectiveness.	223	1.00	4.00	3.0135	1.00216
There is transparency and accountability in school financial management, including budgeting and resource allocation.	223	1.00	4.00	2.6143	1.07560
There is clarity and regularity of reporting and communication to stakeholders, including parents, students, and the broader community.	223	1.00	4.00	2.5202	1.17339
Teachers receive their fringe benefits on time and in the right amount.	223	1.00	4.00	2.9865	1.09248
School facilities are adequately supplied, used and maintained.	223	1.00	4.00	2.8520	1.27364
The availability and effectiveness of professional development opportunities for teachers.	223	1.00	4.00	2.7758	1.07131
Valid N (listwise)	223				

Effective school governance relies on accountability and transparency, as schools are answerable to stakeholders, including students, parents, and the broader community, regarding the quality of education they deliver. Schools are also accountable to stakeholders, including government agencies, accreditation bodies, and other regulatory entities, for meeting the standards they set. There must be accountability and transparency on the effective and efficient usability of resources, such as funding, materials and personnel. Respondents disagreed (Mean=2.7489) in the first item that teacher evaluation is regularly carried out to determine teacher commitment. This means that school systems would not be able to provide pedagogical accountability in an objective manner if teacher evaluation is not conducted rigorously.

In the second item, respondents disagreed (mean=3.0135) that there is regularity and effectiveness in monitoring and evaluating school performance, including student achievement and teacher effectiveness. In the third item, respondents disagreed (mean=2.6143) that there is transparency and accountability of school financial management, including budgeting and resource allocation. In the fifth item, respondents disagreed (Mean=2.9865) that teachers receive their fringe benefits on time and in the right amount. Respondents in the last item disagreed (mean=2.9865) that funds are available for professional development opportunities for teachers. From the data, it can be inferred that there are lapses in institutional transparency and accountability in school governance, which certainly influence the quality of curriculum implementation in secondary schools.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics on Teacher Support and Development

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Teachers are given psycho-social support from management in challenging circumstances.	223	1.00	4.00	1.7578	1.27859
The principal provides teachers with the technology and technical support they need to effectively integrate technology into their teaching practices.	223	1.00	4.00	3.4260	1.14004
The school administrators offer opportunities for teachers to develop their skills and knowledge through training, workshops, and conferences.	223	1.00	4.00	3.1435	1.01211
The principal provides teachers with the resources and didactic materials they need to effectively teach their classes.	223	1.00	4.00	2.7888	1.21500
Leadership gives teachers the autonomy to make decisions about their teaching practices and curriculum, and provides them with the support they need to exercise this autonomy.	223	1.00	4.00	2.9821	.89525
Valid N (listwise)	223				

Teacher development and support are key aspects of teacher productivity, especially in the education production function. A teacher who undergoes professional growth and who receives all forms of teacher support, such as coaching, mentorship, peer support, emotional and technological support, would certainly produce good results. Teachers agreed (mean=1.7578) that they receive psycho-social support from management in challenging circumstances. This type of support is especially important when colleagues are bereaved; however, it usually comes from individual donations. This is fundamental in enhancing psychological stamina for those involved. In the third item, respondents disagreed (Mean=3.4260) that their principal provides teachers with the technology and technical support needed for pedagogic integration of ICTs. Lapses in the use of ICTs in teaching impede effective curriculum implementation to a greater extent. The school administrators seldom offer opportunities for teachers to enhance their skills and deepen their knowledge through targeted training, workshops, and conferences, as seen in the third item.

Respondents disagreed (mean=2.7888) that the principal provides teachers with the resources and didactic materials they need to effectively teach their classes. The Teaching and learning transaction cannot be effectively carried out without adequate didactic materials. Leadership gives teachers the autonomy to make decisions about their teaching practices and curriculum, but does not provide them with the support they need to exercise this autonomy.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics on Curriculum Implementation

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Pairing experienced teachers with newer teachers to provide guidance, support, and coaching.	223	1.00	4.00	2.6323	1.15049
The curriculum is relevant to the needs and interests of students.	223	1.00	4.00	3.0269	1.01306
Teachers have a deep understanding of the curriculum and its requirements.	223	1.00	4.00	3.0448	1.22208
Teachers use effective instructional strategies to deliver the curriculum.	223	1.00	4.00	2.5022	1.26232
Teachers use assessment and feedback to inform instruction and improve student learning.	223	1.00	4.00	2.8700	1.01615
Valid N (listwise)	223				

Respondents in the first item disagreed (mean=2.6323) that experienced teachers collaborate and monitor with newer teachers to provide guidance, support, and coaching. This explains why the teaching process is marred by lots of mishaps. An effective curriculum implementation process requires a lot of monitoring, quality control, and assurance mechanisms to ensure that the processes and methods are meticulously followed to enhance the attainment of set objectives.

Respondents continue to disagree (mean=3.0269) that the school curriculum is relevant to the needs and interests of students. This explains why many students drop out of the school system, and many who graduate lack relevant practical skills. When the curriculum is relevant, students will participate in the curriculum implementation process. Teachers seldom (mean=2.5022) use effective instructional strategies to deliver the curriculum because class sizes are too large for effective use of salient teaching approaches like the competence-based approach and hands-on activities. Teachers are not trained to carry out inclusive teaching. This is a key element that hampers effective differential teaching in classrooms. From the data above, we realise that curriculum implementation is loaded with a lot of lapses, which hamper its effectiveness in secondary schools.

Table 8. Correlations

		Principals_Leadership_and_Management.	Stakeholder_Engagements.	Teacher_support_and_development.	Accountability_and_Transparency.	Curriculum_Development.
Spearman's rho	Principals_Leadership_and_Management	1.000	.668**	.630**	.565**	.456**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000

	N	224	223	223	223	223
Stakeholder_Engagements	Correlation Coefficient	.668**	1.000	.597**	.613**	.496**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	223	223	223	223	223
Teacher_support_and_development	Correlation Coefficient	.630**	.597**	1.000	.761**	.742**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	223	223	223	223	223
Accountability_and_Transparency	Correlation Coefficient	.565**	.613**	.761**	1.000	.614**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	223	223	223	223	223
Curriculum_Development	Correlation Coefficient	.456**	.496**	.742**	.614**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.

	N	223	223	223	223	223
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

The correlation coefficient between principals' leadership and management and curriculum is 0.456, indicating that principals' leadership and management account for 45.6 per cent of the variations in curriculum development. In the second hypothesis, the correlation coefficient is 49.6 per cent, indicating that stakeholder engagements account for 49.6 per cent of the variations in curriculum development. The correlation coefficient in the third hypothesis is 0.614, thus indicating that principals' accountability and transparency account for 61.4 per cent of the variations in the dependent variable. Lastly, the correlation coefficient of 0.742 reveals that teachers' support and development influence curriculum development by 74.2 per cent. Among all four variables studied, teacher support and development appear to influence curriculum development the most. This is, however, not strange because the teacher is the curriculum implementation agent, which translates curriculum policy documents into teachable units. This means that if teacher support and development are properly manipulated, curriculum development will be optimised significantly.

Table 9. Summary of Findings

Hypotheses	Alpha	Level of significance	Findings
Ha1	0.05	0.456	Principal's Leadership and Management influences Curriculum Implementation by 45.6%
Ha2		0.496	Stakeholder Engagements influence Curriculum Implementation by 49.6%
Ha3		0.614	Accountability and Transparency influence Curriculum Implementation by 61.4%
Ha4		0.742	Teacher support and development influences Curriculum Implementation by 74.2%

Discussion

The first hypothesis of the study posits that the principal's leadership and management significantly influence Curriculum Implementation. These results align with Goddard et al. (2015), who found that a principal with strong instructional leadership can create an enabling environment to facilitate teaching and foster students' learning. The study's findings are equally consistent with the instructional leadership theory, as it stresses the relevance of principals' leadership and management as key to ensuring successful curriculum implementation. From the point of view of systems theory, principal leadership and management play a key role as they not only create the interconnectedness of the organisational components that make up the school system, but they also coordinate and direct all activities and processes to ensure the attainment of set objectives. Bahtilla and Xu (2020) noted that for principals to perform their curriculum-instructional role effectively, they need substantial knowledge of curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation. This is right because you cannot manage what you do not master.

In the second hypothesis, we found that stakeholder engagement significantly affects curriculum implementation. The findings corroborate those of Johnson et al. (2021), who found that curriculum

stakeholders significantly influence curriculum development; hence, collaboration with these stakeholders through feedback, critique, and advice can only serve to meld the content and method of delivery of the curriculum. From the perspective of system theory, stakeholders are critical components of the school system, and their engagement influences the functioning of other components, such as teachers, students, and parents, ultimately affecting curriculum implementation. From the perspective of instructional leadership theory, principals who engage stakeholders are more likely to have a clear understanding of curriculum needs and challenges, enabling them to provide targeted support to teachers and improve instructional quality. The main problem here is that most principals consider themselves general managers, thereby neglecting their primary responsibility as pedagogical coaches.

Leithwood et al. (2008). Neumerski (2013) and Liu (2017) argue that in effective schools, principals devote time to instructional activities more than managerial activities. This means that secondary school principals would have to assume their role as instructional supervisors to enhance the quality of curriculum implementation. Ross and Grey (2006) and Liu (2017) buttressed that as curriculum-instructional leaders, principals can shape teaching practices and classroom interactions to improve teaching and learning. Principals who see themselves as Curriculum-instructional leaders work closely with teachers to ensure effective teaching and learning, and also monitor students' progress.

In the third hypothesis, it was found that accountability and transparency significantly influence curriculum implementation by 61.4 per cent. Fullan (2007) noted that Transparency in curriculum implementation can help actors establish clear goals and collaboratively seek approaches to attain them. Epstein (2001) emphasises that transparency and accountability can foster stakeholder engagement and participation in curriculum implementation and also improve students' outcomes. These results align with the instructional leadership theory, as school principals who act as instructional leaders would warrant that teachers be held accountable for delivering high-quality teaching with transparency. When accountability and transparency in school processes are in place, trust and credibility are built among stakeholders, which are required for effective collaboration and problem-solving during implementation (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Effective collaboration among stakeholders ensures proper linkage among all organs in the system, enabling them to function adequately.

In the fourth hypothesis, we observed that teacher support and development significantly affect curriculum implementation by 74.2 per cent. The results are consistent with those obtained by Guskey (2002) and Joyce & Showers (2002), who found that teacher support and development are essential factors in ensuring successful curriculum implementation. Teachers who receive adequate support and development are more likely to implement curriculum reforms effectively. Also, Bandura (1997) noted that teacher development programs can help build teachers' confidence in their ability to implement new curricula, thereby leading to more effective implementation. Deci & Ryan (2000) emphasised that teacher support and development can enhance teacher motivation, thereby increasing commitment to curriculum implementation.

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion: The study suggests that effective school governance and management are critical for successful curriculum implementation. The findings highlight the importance of teacher support and development, accountability and transparency, stakeholder engagement, and principals' leadership and management in ensuring effective curriculum implementation in secondary schools. The results of this

study have important implications for policy development and practical application. Schools and education authorities should prioritise teacher support and development, accountability and transparency, stakeholder engagement, and principals' leadership and management to enhance effective curriculum implementation.

Recommendations: The study's findings led to several key recommendations. First, school management should prioritise teacher support and continuous professional development so that teachers have the skills they need for effective curriculum implementation. Principals, in turn, should uphold accountability and transparency in school governance to enhance the overall effectiveness of curriculum delivery. Additionally, school management should actively promote stakeholder involvement, which includes teachers, parents, and the wider community, to ensure that curriculum implementation aligns with the needs of all parties involved. Finally, efforts should be made to strengthen principals' leadership and management skills, equipping them to successfully guide curriculum implementation. To achieve this, special and periodic seminars and conferences could be organised.

6.0 REFERENCES

1. Ansori, M. (2020). Pengembangan kurikulum madrasah di pesantren. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 1(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v1i1.32>
2. Banathy, B. H. (1991). *Systems design of education: A journey to create the future*. Educational Technology Publications.
3. Bahtilla, B., & Xu, H. (2020). The principal as a curriculum-instructional leader: A strategy for curriculum implementation in Cameroon secondary schools. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 8(4).
4. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
5. Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). Sage.
6. Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management*, 34(5), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680>
7. Caldwell, B. J. (2005). School-based management. *Education Policy Series*, 3, 1–32.
8. Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (2013). *The self-transforming school*. Routledge.
9. Carnoy, M. (2014). *Educational governance and management*. UNESCO.
10. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of the pursuit: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
11. Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of the evidence. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 166–180.
12. Dohlen, H. von, & Karvonen, M. (2018). Teachers' self-reported leadership behaviors in formal and informal situations. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 9(2), 69–89.
13. Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Corwin Press.
14. Fauzan, M., & Groot, W. (2022). Teachers' preferences for online professional development: Evidence from a discrete choice experiment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 119, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103870>
15. Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
16. Fathurrahman, M., & Arifin, H. (2022). The influence of school management on the implementation of the Merdeka Belajar curriculum. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(4), 1274–1286.

17. Fajriana, & Siraj. (2022). Models of good school governance. *Proceedings of Malikussaleh International Conference on Multidisciplinary Studies (MICoMS)*, 3, 00038. <https://doi.org/10.29103/micom.v3i.202>
18. Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 8(3), 381–391.
19. Goddard, R., Goddard, Y., Kim, S., & Miller, R. (2015). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the roles of instructional leadership, teacher collaboration, and collective efficacy beliefs in support of student learning. *American Journal of Education*, 121(4), 501–530.
20. Hasanah, I. (2019). Manajemen kurikulum perspektif Oliva: Telaah epistemologis. *Tadbir: Jurnal Studi Manajemen Pendidikan*, 3(1), 58–75. <https://doi.org/10.29240/jsmp.v3i1.732>
21. Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/095782311111116699>
22. Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Students' achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
23. Johnson, O., Constance, T., & Chrysostom, O. (2021). Analysis of stakeholders involvement in the implementation of the M.A. literature curriculum at Kabale University using e-learning approach. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, 3(1), 199–210. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.3.1.384>
24. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
25. Lakhe, G. (2025). Curriculum development in higher education. *Nepal Journal of Medical Sciences*, 10(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.3126/njms.v10i2.79521>
26. Lähdesmäki, S. A., & Maunula, M. (2022). Student teachers' views on media education related to new literacy skills. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 6(3), 427–442. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.374>
27. Liu, M. S. (2017). A multilevel analysis of the relationship between principals' perceived practices of instructional leadership and teachers' self-efficacy perceptions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(1), 49–69.
28. Lubis, A. F. (2020). Manajemen kurikulum berbasis kerangka kualifikasi nasional Indonesia (KKNI) di perguruan tinggi Islam. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 4(2), 28–40. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v4i2.1248>
29. Lundeberg, M. A., & Levin, B. B. (2003). Prompting the development of pre-service teachers' beliefs through cases, action research, problem-based learning, and technology. In *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education*, 6, 23–42.
30. Marsh, C. J., & Willis, G. (2007). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches, ongoing issues* (4th ed.). Pearson.
31. Matowo, F., & Tenha, J. (2023). School leadership and curriculum implementation: Challenges and constraints in the Zimbabwean education system. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 7(5), 209–220.
32. Mitchell, C., & Castle, J. B. (2005). The instructional role of elementary school principals. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(3), 409–433.
33. Ngware, M. W., Oketch, M., & Ezeh, A. C. (2019). Quality and access to secondary education in Sub-Saharan Africa. *International Review of Education*, 65(2), 1–23.

34. Neumerski, C. M. (2013). Rethinking instructional leadership: A review. What do we know about principal, teacher, and coach instructional leadership, and where should we go from here? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(2), 310–347.
35. Nuraeni, R., & Irawan, I. (2021). Implementation of scientific integration concept monitoring and evaluation on the Pesantren learning curriculum. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 5(2), 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v5i2.2186>
36. OECD. (2016). *School leadership for learning: Insights from TALIS 2013*. OECD Publishing.
37. Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2018). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (7th ed.). Pearson.
38. Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation*. University of California Press.
39. Ross, J. A., & Grey, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(3), 798–822.
40. Sasmito, A. P., Kustono, D., Purnomo, & Elmunsyah, H. (2020). Conceptual model for improving quality of teachers in Indonesian vocational schools. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(1), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i1.20390>
41. UNESCO. (2017). *Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments*. UNESCO Publishing.
42. Walker, A., Haiyan, Q., & Shuang, Z. (2011). Secondary school principals in curriculum reform: Victims or accomplices? *Frontiers of Education in China*, 6(3), 388–403.