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ABSTRACT
The study determined the relationship between supervisors’ leadership styles, instructors’ job satisfaction and performance in literacy centers in Borno State. The sample of the study comprised all the two hundred and twenty one (221) instructors across Borno State. Twenty one (21) were used for test-re-tested while the remaining 200 instructors were used for the final study. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics of frequency count, percentage, mean and standard deviation while Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to test the null hypothesis. Decision was taken at P ≤ 0.05 level of significance. The findings showed that, the pattern of supervisors’ leadership styles preferred in literacy centers across Borno State was the consideration style of leadership. Based on the findings recommendations were made considering the importance of the leadership style preferred by instructors in literacy centres, it is recommended that appointment of supervisors should not be based on quarter system or who-you-know in the government or on political bases, rather it should be based on merit. Government should motivate and provide the necessary incentives such as good working environment (staff accommodation, class rooms, chairs etc) and other fringe benefits compared with their counterparts in other occupations so that their performance will be high once their morale is boosted. Government in collaboration with the State Agency for Mass Literacy should organize on-the- job training in the form of seminars/workshops for instructors to improve on their level of instructional performance.
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INTRODUCTION
Leadership is the capability to influence a group of people to achieve a vision or set of goals. It is a widely studied subject in management (Wen, Ho, Kelana, Othman, & Syed, 2019). According to Kalsoom, Khan, & Zubair (2018), leadership is the most critical component in an organization and the most important skill for the organization’s leaders. It brings direct and indirect impact to the employee’s performance. Othman, Saad, Robani, & Abdullah (2014) stated that leaders play a crucial role to foster a culture that encourages knowledge sharing, employee retention and create loyalty to the organization. In a highly competitive environment, organizations heavily depend on their managers to drive transformation and innovation to gain a competitive advantage over their rivals. Employees are the biggest asset of the organizations. Factors to improve the employees’ job performances and well-being have become a big challenge to organizations, particularly leadership. This requires manager to understand the effectiveness and impact of different leadership styles towards employees’ performances. Leadership has been considered one of the most important phenomenon affecting organizational performance. Armstrong (2004) defines leadership as influence, power and the legitimate authority acquired by a leader to be able to effectively transform the organization through direction of the human resources that are the most important organizational asset, leading to the achievement of desired purpose. This can be done through the articulation of the vision and mission of the organization at every moment and influence the staff to define their power to share this vision.

This is also described by Sashkin and Sashkin (2003) as visionary leadership. However, according to them, the concept of leadership that matters is not being limited to those at the top of the organization.
such as the chief executive officer or principal/head teacher, but depends on certain characteristics of the leader. It involves much more than the leader’s personality in which leadership is seen as more of motivating followers as achieve goals (Shashkin, 2003;2). This is supported by Lav Tzu (as reported in Shashkin, 2003;7) that good leadership commits to doing less and being more. Good performance in any secondary school should not only be considered in terms of academic rigor, but should also focus on other domains of education like the affective and psychomotor domains. This should be the vision of every leader in such a school and the achievement of this shared vision. Mitonga Monga and Coetzee (2012) consider leadership as the pattern associated with managerial behavior, which is designed to integrate the organizational or personal interest and effects for achieving particular objectives.

**Democratic Leader** – This refers to a leader whose focus of power is more with the group as a whole and there is greater interaction within the group leadership functions, in this respect, and shared with members of the group and the leader is more part of a team.

**Autocratic leader:** This refers to a leader whose focus of power is with him. The leader alone exercises decision making and authority for determining policy, procedures for achieving goals, work tasks and relationships, control of rewards or punishment.

**Laisses-faire leader** this refers to a leader who passes the focus of power to members of the group to allow them freedom of action and not interfere.

House (1971) identifies four main dimensions of leadership behaviour. These include Directed leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership and Achievement-oriented leadership.

i. **Directive leadership** – this involves letting subordinates know exactly what is expected of them and giving specific directions.

ii. **Supportive leadership** – this involves a friendly and approachable manner and displaying concern for the needs and welfare of subordinates.

iii. **Participative leadership** – involves consulting with subordinates and the evaluation of their opinions and suggestions before the leader makes the decision.

iv. **Achievement-oriented leadership** - involves setting challenging goals for subordinates, seeking improvement in their performance and showing confidence in their ability to perform well.

In their study on principals’ leadership, Bolman & Deal (1991) identified four dimensions of leadership.

These are (i) structural leadership, (ii) human leadership, (iii) political leadership and (iv) symbolic leadership.

**Structural Leadership** – this is a leadership situation which is concerned with structures, strategy, environment, implementation, experimentation and adaptation. A principal with structural leadership places emphasis on data analysis, sets clear goals and direction, holds people accountable for results and tries to solve organizational problems with new policies and rules.

**Human Resources Leadership** - This is a leadership situation where the leader is seen as a catalyst and servant whose leadership behaviour believes in people and communicates that belief. He is visible and accessible, he empowers, increases participation, supports his staff, shares information, moves decision making down into the organization.

**Political leadership** – this is concerned with leadership influence through coalition and building. A principal with political leadership always clarifies what he wants and what he can get, he assesses the distribution of power and interests; he builds linkages to other stakeholders, he uses persuasion first then negotiation and coercion only where necessary.

**Symbolic Leadership** – this designates leadership influence through interpretation and inspiration. A principal with this type of leadership views organization as a stage or theatre to play certain roles and gives impression. He uses symbols to capture attention to important functions.

Fatima (2002), conducted a study on leadership styles and motivation as tool for effective staff productivity of national Directorate of Employment (NDE), Yobe state. A population sample of sixty (60) were used for the study. A questionnaire, journal, and magazine were used in collecting data for the study and the data collected was analyzed using simple percentage. The findings of the study reveals that the average percentage, the findings also shows that leadership can be made more effective and efficient if great emphasis is put on staff motivation, welfare and infrastructural development. The study is relevant
to this work because both studies see leadership styles as tools that will lead to staff productivity in an organization.

It is therefore important for an adult education Supervisor to be great, effective and a true leader. An effective and true leader is one who does not put himself before others. He is humble, differential, and friendly and trust worthy in dealing with his subordinates (instructors). These types of leadership behaviour are expected of any Supervisor in a work-setting environment. To what extent do the above leadership styles affect instructors’ job satisfaction?

**Statement of the Problem**

It was believed that good leadership is characterized by the provision of good working environment, facilities, good conditions of service for instructors. However, it was discovered by the researcher that the leadership in the agency have done little about the provision of the above listed in the agency. This is evident as almost all the literacy centres have no permanent structures. Most of the literacy centres are erected with zinc and most of them have been blown off by windstorm, as a result most literacy classes are carried out under shade in the dry season. Worst still, most literacy centres cannot operate especially during raining season; this has resulted to the closure of most literacy centres in the state.

**Purpose of the Study**

The objective of the study is to:

1. Determine the types of supervisors’ leadership styles in Literacy Centres in Borno State.

**Research Question**

One research question was formulated to guide the study:

1. What are the types of Supervisors’ leadership styles in Literacy Centres in Borno State?

**Hypotheses**

H01: There is no significant relationship between initiating leadership style, job satisfaction and performance of instructors in literacy centres in Borno State

**METHODOLOGY**

This is a correlation design that correlated the patterns of supervisors’ leadership styles, in Literacy Centres in Borno State. Correlation design was used because the data used for the study consisted of pairs of observations. Ferguson (1981) argued that correlational design is concerned with describing the degree or magnitude of the relationship between two or more variables. The target population for this study was all the two hundred and twenty one (221) adult instructors in Literacy Centres in Borno State. 21 instructors were used for test-retest, while the remaining two hundred (200) instructors were used for the final study.

Data for this study was collected using questionnaire tagged Leadership Styles Descriptive Questionnaire (LSDQ). To validate the instrument, a face and content validity was carried out by three experts in the Department of Continuing Education and Extension Services, University of Maiduguri. The internal consistency of the instrument otherwise known as reliability was determined through test-retest. The responses of the respondents for the test-retest were computed using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC). A positive significant correlation of 0.72 was obtained in the first test while 0.75 was obtained in the second test. Hence, the instrument is considered reliable for the study. The data collected were presented in tables and analyzed using descriptive statistics of frequency, percentages, Mean and Standard Deviation, while Pearson-Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test hypothesis.
RESULTS

Research question: What is the type of supervisors’ leadership style in Literacy Centres in Borno State?

Table 1: Frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation of Initiating Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Mean / SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supervisor does not make his/her attitude clear to instructors</td>
<td>SA (14.5) A (26) SD (6.5) D (53)</td>
<td>2.49±0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisor assigns instructor to a particular task</td>
<td>139 (69.5) A (22.5) D (3)</td>
<td>3.11±0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervisor makes instructors to know what is expected of them</td>
<td>25 (12.5) A (15.5) SD (3.5) D (68.5)</td>
<td>2.40±0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supervisor makes programme planned are implemented according to its objectives</td>
<td>135 (67.5) A (19) SD (6) D (7.5)</td>
<td>3.00±0.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervisor sticks to his decision concerning the organization</td>
<td>40 (20) A (11) SD (9.5) D (59.5)</td>
<td>2.32±0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervisor places emphasis on getting the work done</td>
<td>125 (62.5) A (17.5) SD (14) D (6)</td>
<td>2.83±0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Supervisor forces instructors to accept organizational realities</td>
<td>49 (24.5) A (6) SD (20.5) D (49)</td>
<td>2.16±0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Supervisor desires loyalty and commitment to the organization</td>
<td>66 (33) A (16.5) SD (8.5) D (42)</td>
<td>2.57±0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Supervisor always pays close supervision to getting work done</td>
<td>126 (63) A (18.5) SD (11) D (7.5)</td>
<td>2.89±0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Supervisor encourages instructors to express their feelings and ideas concerning the organization</td>
<td>122 (61) A (9) SD (7) D (23)</td>
<td>2.72±0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>856 A (287) SD (197) D (642)</td>
<td>0.1167±0.9421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number at top represents the frequency count, numbers in parenthesis is the (%) percentage

Table 1 shows the statistical summary of the results obtained from this research work. This helps in answering research question one (1): What is the type of supervisors’ leadership styles in Literacy Centres in Borno State? The table above shows the Initiating Leadership Styles type of supervisors’ leadership styles from which ten (10) questions were considered. Frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation of joined options (i.e. strongly disagree, disagree, strongly agree, agree) were also displayed in the table. The only total mean and SD were discussed in this descriptive case. The first question “supervisor does not make his or her attitude clear to instructors” from which 13 respondents representing 6.5% strongly disagree, 106(53%) disagree, 29(14.5%) strongly agree, 52(26%) agree. From this question it could be seen that majority of the respondents disagree that supervisors does not make their attitude clear to instructors. The item supervisor’s clear attitude to instructors has a total mean and SD of 2.49±0.820. The second question “supervisor assign instructor to a particular task” from which 6(3%) strongly disagree, 10(5%) disagree, 139(69.5%) strongly agree while 42(22.5%) agree. Majority of the respondents strongly agree that supervisor assign instructor to particular tasks this has the total mean and SD of 3.11±0.619. The third question “the supervisor does not coordinate the work of his instructor” in answering this question 7(3.5%) strongly disagree, 137(68.5) disagree, 25(12.5) strongly agree, 31(15.5%) agree. This result shows that most of the respondents disagree that supervisor’s does not coordinate the work of his instructors this has the total mean and SD of 2.40±0.789. The next question “supervisors make instructors to know what is expected of them” in respond to this question 12(6%) strongly disagree, 15(7.5%) disagree 135(67.5) strongly agree, 38(19%) agree. The result shows that
The majority of the respondents strongly disagree that supervisors make instructors know what is expected of them and this has the total mean and SD of 3.00±0.712. The next question “supervisor does not stick to his decision concerning the organization” in response to the question 19(9.5%) strongly disagree, 119(59.5%) disagree, 40(20%) strongly agree while 22(11%) agree. The response shows that most respondents disagree with the question and it has the total mean and SD of 2.32±0.795. The next question “Supervisor places emphasis on getting the work done” 28(14%) strongly disagree, 12(6%) disagree, 125(62.5%) strongly agree 35(17.5%) agree. This shows that majority of the respondents strongly agree with the question and the item has the total mean and SD of 2.83±0.878. The next question “supervisors forces instructors to accept organizational realities” 41(20.5%) strongly disagree, 98(49%) disagree, 49(24.5%) strongly agree while 12(6%) agree. From the result we can see that most of the respondents disagree with the question and it has the total mean and SD of 2.16±0.817. The next question “the supervisor desires loyalty and commitment to the organization” 17(8.5%) strongly disagree, 84(42%) disagree, 66(33%) strongly agree while 33(16.5%) agree. From the result, it shows that majority of the respondents disagree that supervisor desires loyalty and commitment to the organization and it has a total mean and SD of 2.57±0.865. The next question “supervisor always pays close supervision in getting work done” which the response are 22(11%) strongly disagree, 15(7.5%) disagree, 126(63%) strongly agree, 37(18.5%) agree. This clearly shows that supervisor always pays close supervision in getting work done and it has the total mean and SD of 2.89±0.831. The last question in this section is “supervisors does encourage instructors to express their feelings and ideas” the response are 14(17%) strongly disagree, 46(23%) disagree, 122(61%) strongly agree, 18(9%) agree. This shows that supervisors do not encourage instructors to express their feelings and ideas a total mean and SD of 2.72±0.724 were also obtained. From this table checking on the joint mean and standard deviation (SD) one can see the difference on the two major options.

**H01:** There is no significant relationship between initiating leadership style, job satisfaction and performance in literacy centers in Borno state.

**Table 2: Multiple correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Initiation leadership style</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Leadership Style</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision**

The correlation table above described the relationship between initiating leadership style, job satisfaction and job performance. Responses from the respondent’s show that at 0.05 level of significant/alpha, there was a positive correlation of 0.121 with p-value of 0.136 of job satisfactions with correlation value of 0.142 with p-value of 0.066 of job performance. This when compared with the alpha value of 0.05 it reveals that there is a significant difference between leadership style, job satisfaction and job performance. This means that the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate hypothesis which states as “there is no significant relationship between leadership style, job satisfaction and job performance is accepted.

**Table 3: ANOVA result Significant at P<0.05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>291.668</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>145.834</td>
<td>199.336</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1679.751</td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1971.420</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>199.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Decision**

From the Anova table the p-value 0.000 (0.01 significant level) shows there is strong significant relationship between Initiating Leadership Style and job satisfaction with job performance. Regression analysis result displaying consideration of leadership style, job satisfaction and job performance, the result shows how good is the fit, the regression result reveals that the P-value is greater than 0.05, considered it not significant. Which answers the question: on consideration of supervisors’ leadership style will not significantly contribute to instructor’s job satisfaction and performance (leadership style, job satisfaction and job performance). Although the regression value ($r = 0.680$) explained the model slightly below 60% and the $F = 46.524$ it also shows that there is still no significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate hypothesis which states that, “there is no significant relationship between supervisors’ leadership styles, job satisfaction and job performance is accepted”.

**DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

The results of the two types of supervisors leadership style reveals that the supervisors’ in literacy centers across the state exhibited the consideration pattern of leadership style. This is shown by the mean score of $0.1208 \pm 0.8591$ while Initiating Leadership Style has mean score of $0.1167 \pm 0.9421$. This indicated that supervisors’ strive to promote group harmony and social need satisfaction. He is also friendly trustworthy and interacts freely with his instructors’.

The study also showed that there was a positive relationship between supervisors’ pattern of leadership styles with the dimensions of instructors’ performance and job satisfaction. This confirms some similar previous researches. For example, Ebrahim (2018), see the relationship between supervisors’ leadership styles and instructors’ performance as a motivating influence to the extent that instructors see such behavior as an immediate or potential source of their need satisfaction and their ability to perform well. This implies that supervisors can motivate and satisfy their instructors as well as making them perform in a particular situation by adapting the right pattern of leadership style.

The result on the dimension of job satisfaction showed a significant relationship with two dimensions of job satisfaction (supervision and co-worker). This perhaps is because the supervisor have the responsibility of directly supervising their work and they (instructors) are satisfied with the style exhibited by the supervisors during supervision. As regard to co-worker relationship, it indicated that supervisors in literacy centers across the state influence decision making and instill team spirit among instructors.

The study reveals that there was no significant relationship between supervisors’ leadership style and instructor’s job satisfaction with working environment. This implies that supervisors in literacy centers do not provide instructors’ with facilities (staff room, chairs, tables etc.). Larduma (1996), supported this view when he stated that, provision of facilities in the administration of adult education is yard stick for measuring the standard of adult education programme in Nigeria. However, he observed that there was inadequate instructional materials namely, namely primers, note books, instructors manual, duster, blackboard and other equipment like inadequate class room facilities for adult instructors and learners.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended among others that:

i. Considering the importance of the consideration leadership style preferred by instructors in literacy centres, it is recommended that appointment of supervisors should not be based on quarter system or who-you-know in the government or on political bases, rather it should be based on merit.

ii. Government in collaboration with the Stage Agency for Mass Literacy should organize on-the-job training in the form of seminars/workshops for instructors to improve on their level of instructional performance.
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