

Leadership Styles and Teachers Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Yauri Local Government, Kebbi State, Nigeria

Wakkala G.T.¹, Dr. Danjuma M.², Aliyu A. D. Z. & Bashir K.⁴

¹Department of Education, Kebbi State University of Science And Technology, Aliero, Nigeria

²Department of Education, Kebbi State University of Science And Technology, Aliero, Nigeria

³Department of Education, Kebbi State University of Science And Technology, Aliero, Nigeria

³Department of Education, Kebbi State University of Science And Technology, Aliero, Nigeria

Abstract: The study aimed to examine the relationship between leadership style and teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Yauri Zone of Kebbi State, Nigeria. This was a correlational study that involved 148 teacher respondents from three public secondary schools. The instrument used for data collection was a questionnaire (self-devised from related review). Descriptive analysis involved the use of means, while Pearson's (*r*) and multiple regressions were used to test the hypotheses. It was found that leadership style and teachers' performance had very small (almost no) relationship. However, the result revealed that transformational leadership was a positive significant predictor of teachers' performance, while transactional leadership was a negative insignificant predictor of teachers' performance. This led to the conclusion that leadership styles had less influence on teachers' performance, transformational leadership was a positive significant predictor of teachers' performance and transactional leadership was insignificant in predicting teachers' performance. It was therefore recommended that transformational style of leadership should be emphasized/employed by the school administrators. It suggests that further study should be conducted on other forms of leadership not considered by this study.

Key words: Leadership styles, Teachers' Performance, Public, secondary schools

Date of Submission: 26-09-2022

Date of Acceptance: 11-10-2022

I. Introduction

It is a common knowledge that education is upheld as a fundamental human right globally. Teachers are the backbones of the processes involved in ensuring the successful achievement of the aims and objectives of education and are in turn, influenced by the effective leadership styles of the school administrator. The principal is the school head, leader and school administrator in public secondary schools. According to Segun-adeniran (2015), leadership refers to influencing members of a group to collectively take action in a particular direction to achieve a common goal. The school is an organization with a group of people working together to achieve a common stated goal. Successful achievement of organizational goals depends on the effective management/leadership styles applied. One of the major aims of setting a formal school is to train individuals to become responsible members of the society. Effectiveness of such training could be attributed largely to good teachers' performance in discharging their duties which in turn, could be influenced by the working environment provided by the school leaders. In view of this, Ezenwa (2005) sees leadership as the art or process of influencing people to willingly and enthusiastically strive towards the achievement of organizational objectives.

According to Shamaki (2015), leadership style is the pattern or collection of leadership behavior characterizing a given leader. He further believes that a range of behavior of a leader is represented by his leadership style, in order to succeed a leader adopts a particular style of leadership. This therefore, tells us that leadership is very crucial in the smooth running of an organization and successful realization of its stated goals. In an organization, a leader can take any style of leadership depending on the condition at hand, as he is a means to an end in that organization (Shamaki, 2015). There exists a number of leadership styles practiced in various organizations. However, this study was limited to two styles of leadership namely; Transactional and Transformational leadership styles.

Transactional leadership style: This style of leadership usually rewards employees on the basis of what they do. Segun-adeniran (2015) held that the word "transaction" implies that rewards are given positively or negatively for actions taken. He further states that when a productive action is taken which result in not meeting the set goals, the individual is negatively rewarded; but when an employee takes an unproductive action, he/she

is accorded due punishment. Abba, Anumaka&Gaité (2016) stated that transactional leadership focuses on the role of supervision, organisation and group performance. They further state that transactional leader promotes compliance of followers through both rewards and punishments. Similarly, Petersen (2012) in Segun-adeniran (2015) reiterated that the transactional style of leadership professes that people are motivated by rewards and punishment.

Transformational leadership style: This was developed by Downton and Burns in 1973 and 1978 respectively. He noted that this form of leadership style differs from the transactional that operates a reward system among employees; the transformational leaders set an example for their followers and ensure dramatic changes within the organization. The leader influences the employees through motivation and creating demanding but yet challenging opportunities for individuals in the organization to add their quality input in order to achieve set objectives. This kind of leadership clearly outlines goals and objectives to be achieved and positively drives subordinates to its achievement (Segun-adeniran, 2015).

Teacher Performance: This has been described differently by different scholars. In 1998, Robert and Tim described teachers' performance as the act of accomplishing or executing a given task. Teachers' performance has also been defined by Obilade (1999) as the duties performed by a teacher at a particular period in the school system in attaining the goals of education. Teachers' performance according to Akinyemi (1993) and Okeniyi (1995), is the teachers' ability to combine relevant inputs for the enhancement of the processes of teaching and learning. However, (Meindl,1995) argued that worker's level of participation in the day to day running of the organization determines the teachers' performance. In the a similar spirit, Various writers identified different variables for measuring teachers' performance; effective teaching, lesson note preparation, effective use of scheme of work, effective supervision, monitoring of students' work and disciplinary ability are virtues which teachers should uphold effectively in the school system (Adepoju ,1996). Teacher' performance could be measured through annual report of his/ her activities in terms of performance in teaching, lesson preparation, and lesson presentation, mastery of subject matter, competence, teachers' commitment to job and extra-curricular activities (Abwalla, 2014). However, the researchers measured teachers' performance in terms of lesson plan preparation, teaching, assessing students, and co-curricular activities. As such, the main tasks of the school leaders are to create a conducive atmosphere for the teachers to be able to achieve desired changes in students. It is believed that effectiveness of teachers' performance is determined by different leadership styles (Ibukun, 1997). For this reason, the school leaders are expected to identify the needs of their teachers and try to meet or satisfy them in order to encourage their effective performance (Abwalla, 2014). This argument was supported by Ijaiya (2000) in his remarked that teachers in Nigeria express a desire for more participation in decision-making.

Leadership theories: transactional and transformational leadership theories, suggested some variables of leadership styles which relate to employee performance (Abba, Anumaka&Gaité, 2016). The transformational theory suggests that transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation (Abba, Anumaka&Gaité, 2016). It has been observed that a leader might transform subordinates interest and at the same time motivate his followers or subordinates in order to perform as expected or even beyond expectation and achieve greater goals in any organization. Bolden, et al. (2003), explained that transactional leadership is an emphasis on the importance of relationship between the head and the subordinates and usually focusing on mutual benefits. This relationship might result into rewards, recognition as well as return on hard work. Transactional leaders recognise the actions of their subordinates in order to achieve outcomes and develop agreements with them, which makes clear what they want receive if they do something right and what will happen if they do something wrong (Waldman, et al. 2001). Basing on the propositions of these two theorists, it is reasonable to suggest that leadership styles may be related to teacher performance at all levels of education including secondary schools.

II. Literature Review

Al-Baradie (2014) believed that treating employees with respect, kindness and fairness by their leaders increases productivity. Investigation by Obiwuru, et al. (2011) on the effect of leadership style on organizational performance in small-scale enterprises in Nigeria revealed that transformational style of leadership had a positive but insignificant effect on performance. Another study on the relationship between effective leadership and employee performance in public and private sector organizations in India by Pradeep and Pabhu (2011) disclosed that transformational leadership had a significant positive relationship with the employee performance. The impact of leadership style on employee performance in private schools in Pakistan was studied by Paracha, et al. (2012). They found that transformational leadership had a significant positive correlation with employee performance. The result of the analysis by Thamarin (2012) on the influence of transformational leadership on employee performance in shipping company in Jakarta, Indonesia, indicates a significant positive influence of transformational leadership on employees' performance. Paracha, et al. (2012) studied the impact of leadership style (transformational and transactional leadership) on employee performance in private schools in Pakistan.

Their results indicated that transformational leadership has a significant positive correlation with employee performance. Abba, Anumaka&Gaito (2016) conducted a study to examine the influence of leadership practices on productivity of academic staff in polytechnics in Nigeria. The finding that transformational leadership is a significant a positive predictor suggests that it is an important factor of employee productivity. Their study recommends that managers of organizations such as polytechnics should emphasize the transformational leadership practice in providing leadership to their staff. Conversely, their finding that transactional leadership did not significantly predict employee productivity leads to the assumption that it is not a very important factor in the effort to promote productivity of academic staff.

In their study to investigate the effects of leadership style on organizational performance, Obiwuru, et al. (2011) found out that there was a significant positive effect of transactional leadership style on organizational performance. Ojokuku, Odetayo and Sajuyigbe (2012) examined the impact of leadership style on organizational performance in selected Banks in Ibadan Nigeria. Regression results showed that transactional leadership as a negative and insignificant predictor of organizational performance. Pradeep and Prabhu (2011) in their study conducted in India revealed that transactional leadership had a significant positive relationship with employee performance.

Despite the above researchers' effort to research on leadership styles and teacher/employee performance/productivity, none of these studies, to the best of the researchers' knowledge, was conducted in the context of public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state. This prompted the researchers to undertake the study.

III. Research Questions

- i. What is the level of leadership style usage in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi State?
- ii. What is the level of teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi State?
- iii. Is there any significant relationship between leadership styles and teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state?
- iv. Is leadership style a significant positive predictor of teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state?

3.1 Research Hypotheses:

- i. There is no significant relationship between leadership style and teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state?
- ii. Transformational leadership style is a significant positive predictor of teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state
- iii. Transactional leadership style is not a significant positive predictor of teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state

IV. Methodology

Correlation design was used and data were collected using a self-designed questionnaire. The questionnaire comprised three sections. Section A was on the personal information of the respondents with questions on sex, academic qualification, field of your specialization and years of related working experience. Section B covered the items on leadership styles (independent variable) basing on two styles of leadership – transactional and transformational leadership styles. Section C covered the dependent variable which is teacher performance with four aspects in consideration namely lesson plan preparations, teaching, assessing students and involvement in co-curricular activities. The questions in section A were nominal questions with appropriate responses required. The questions in sections B and C were ordinal questions scaled using the four-point Likert scale from a minimum of 1 strongly disagree (SD), 2 disagree (D), 3 agree (A) and 4 strongly agree (SA). Purposeful sampling technique was used in choosing the sample for the study. The sample size of the study comprises 147 respondents from three public secondary schools that were one boarding school for boys (Government secondary school Yauri), one boarding school for girls (Government girls science college Yauri) and one mixed (boys and girls) day school (Abarshi secondary school Yauri).

V. Results And Discussions

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Item	Question	Characteristic	Distribution	
			Frequency	Percentage
1	Sex	Male	100	67.57
		Female	48	32.43
		Total	148	100
2	Academic qualification	Degree	87	58.78
		H N D	09	6.08
		Diploma	15	10.14
		N C E	37	25.0
		Total	148	100
3	Area of specialization	Sciences	75	50.68
		Social Sciences	28	18.92
		Arts	45	30.40
		Total	148	100
4	Years of experience	Below 5 years	7	4.73
		5 – 10 years	25	16.89
		11 – 15 years	34	22.97
		16 and above years	82	55.41
		Total	148	100

The data on demographic characteristics of the respondents of the study in Table 1 show that majority of the respondents are male (67.57%), degree holders (58.78%), science specialists (50.68%), with more than 16 years teaching experience (55.41%),

Research question one: What is the level of leadership style usage in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi State?

The study here, sought to determine the level at which leadership style is used in public secondary schools. To do this, leadership style (Independent Variable) was measured in terms of two constructs namely: transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles. Questions related to these constructs were designed and presented to respondents. The responses obtained from the respondents in relation to leadership style are summarized and presented in table 2 below:

Table 2: Means on Leadership Styles Construct

Domains of Instructional Supervision	Mean	Interpretation
Transformational Leadership	2.59	Poor
Transactional Leadership	2.78	Good
Overall mean = 2.68		Good

The independent variables in the study were two constructs that define leadership styles, namely; transformational and transactional leadership styles. Nine questions were asked in association with transformational leadership, five of them had mean scores of about 2.45 – 2.59, four items had means of about 2.61 – 2.74, and also a total mean of about 2.59 (as shown in table 2), which on the scale used corresponded to “disagree” and hence a poor rating of the use of the transformational leadership style in the public secondary school. Also, questions asked to measure transactional leadership were nine, five of which obtained means of approximately 2.7, two items had means score of about 2.6, one item got a mean of 2.59, and one item obtained a mean of score of 3.01, and a total mean of 2.78 was obtained on transactional leadership, as indicated in table 2, which on the scale used corresponded to “agree” and hence a good rating of the use of the transactional leadership practice in the public secondary schools. The table also indicates the overall mean score of 2.68 obtained on leadership style, which on the scale used, corresponded to “agree” and hence a good overall self-rating of the respondents on leadership styles used in public secondary schools in Yauri local government.

Research question two: What is the level of teachers’ performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi State?

To answer this question, the Dependent Variable (Teacher Performance) was measured based on four dimensions; lesson plan preparation, teaching, assessing students and co-curricular activities. A number of questions were designed on each dimension, and presented to the respondents. The summary of the responses obtained are presented in table 3:

Table 3: Means on Teacher Performance Constructs

Table 1: Mean on the Instructional Supervision		
Domains of Instructional Supervision	Mean	Interpretation
Lesson plan preparation	2.84	Good
Teaching	2.67	Good
Assessing Students	3.12	Good
Co-curricular activities	2.58	Poor
Overall mean = 2.80		Good

The dependent variable was divided into aspects namely; lesson plan preparation, teaching, assessing the students and co-curricular activities. The items were scaled using the four-point Likert scale ranging from a minimum of 1 for the worst case scenario (strongly disagree) to a maximum of 4, which is the best case scenario (Strongly agree). For lesson plan preparation, five items were designed to measure it. Three of the items had the mean of approximately 2.9, one item had a mean of 3.05 and one item had a mean of 2.41. A total mean score of 2.84 was obtained as indicated in table 3, which on the scale used corresponded to “agree” and hence a good self-rating of the respondents on lesson plan preparation. For teaching dimension, seven questions were presented, two of which had means of approximately 2, four items had means of about 2.6 – 2.9 and one item had a mean of 3.01. Table 3 showed the total mean score of about 2.67 obtained by teaching dimension, which on the scale used corresponded to “agree” and hence a good self-rating of the respondents on teaching. For the dimension “assessing students”, three of the presented items had means of almost 3 and one item had a mean of 2.88. Table 3 indicates assessing students got a total mean of about 3.12, which on the scale used corresponded to “agree” and hence a good self-rating of the respondents on assessing students. For co-curricular activities, three of the items presented had mean scores of about 2, one item had a mean of 2.88, and a total mean of 2.58 was obtained as indicated in table 3, which on the scale used corresponded to “disagree” and hence a poor self-rating of the respondents on co-curricular activities. An overall mean score of 2.80 was obtained on teacher performance, which on the scale used, corresponded to “agree” and hence a good overall self-rating of the respondents on teachers performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government.

Research question three: Is there any significant relationship between leadership styles and teachers’ performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state?

Here, the study sought to examine if the relationship exists significantly between leadership styles and teachers’ performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state

Table 4: Correlation between Leadership Styles and Teacher Performance

Correlations		
		Teacher Performance
Leadership Styles	Pearson Correlation	0.066
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.428
	N	148

Table 5 presents a Pearson correlation’s value ($r = 0.066$) indicating a very small positive relationship between the leadership styles used and teachers performance in secondary school. This implies that the leadership styles used (in this case, transformational and transactional leadership styles) are not the only factors influencing teachers’ performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government. This means that there are other factors which may include other styles of leadership and so on, which are not captured under this paper.

Research question four: Is leadership style a significant positive predictor of teachers’ performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi state?

To establish whether the leadership styles predicted the teachers performance in public secondary schools, the dependent variable namely, teachers performance was regressed against the independent variables leadership styles the results on the same results are in Tabl 4.

Table 4: Regression of Teachers Performance on Leadership Styles

Model	Standardized B	Significance p
Transactional leadership	-0.093	0.254
Transformational leadership	0.173	0.035
Adjusted R square = 0.025 F = 2.918, P = 0.057		

The results in Table 4.32 show that the two leadership styles explained 2.5% of the variation in teacher performance (adjusted R2 =0.025). This means that 97.5% of the joint variation was accounted for by other

factors which this study does not consider. The regression model was insignificant ($F = 2.918$, $p = 0.057 > 0.05$). Only the transformational leadership style ($\beta = 0.173$, $p = 0.035 < 0.05$) was a positive significant predictor of teachers performance while transactional leadership style ($\beta = -0.093$, $p = 0.254 > 0.05$) was not. The study found that there is a very small positive (almost no) relationship between leadership styles and teachers performance. This finding disagrees with the finding of Abwalla (2014) who found that there is a significant positive relationship between principal leadership styles and teachers performance. This disagreement lies in the fact that the two studies measured leadership styles with different constructs. The former considers leadership styles in terms transformational and transactional styles of leadership, while later considers leadership styles in terms of autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles. In support of this, similarly, Segun-adeniran (2015) investigated the effect of leadership styles on the job productivity of library staff, focusing on autocratic, democratic, transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles. The findings revealed that leadership and leadership styles employed affects productivity and general performance of librarians, library assistants and library staff. The study also, found that transformational leadership influences academic staff productivity was supported. This finding is in agreement with that of Thamrin (2012), who analyses the influence of transformational leadership on employee performance in shipping company in Jakarta, Indonesia. The results showed that transformational leadership had a positive significant influence on employees' performance. Also, the finding of Abba, Anumaka & Gaité (2016), agrees with this finding that transformational leadership is a significant a positive predictor of employee productivity. In the same line, Paracha et al. (2012) indicated that transformational leadership significantly positively correlated with employee performance. Finding by Obiwuru et al. (2011) also supports this finding, that transformational leadership style had a positive but insignificant effect on performance. Furthermore, the findings revealed that transactional leadership style had an insignificant influence on teachers' performance. This finding agrees with the finding of Abba, Anumaka & Gaité (2016), who found that transactional style of leadership had insignificant influence on employee productivity. It is also in line with the finding of Ojokuku, Odetayo and Sajuyigbe (2012), that transactional leadership as a negative and insignificant predictor of organizational performance. However, is in contradiction with other findings. For example, Pradeep and Prabhu (2011) found that transactional leadership had a significant positive relationship with employee performance. Singh (2015) found out that transactional leadership played a significant role in predicting employee productivity in private banks in India. Similarly, Obiwuru et al. (2011) found that transactional leadership style had a significant positive effect on organization performance. These suggest that the influence of transactional leadership style depends upon the organizational context. The findings of this study indicate that transformational style of leadership is preferred to transactional style in public secondary schools in Yauri local government.

VI. Conclusion

This study linked the teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Yauri local government of Kebbi State, Nigeria with two styles of leadership (transformational and transactional) with a view to establish the relationship between the leadership style and teachers performance. The correlation reveals that there is a very small (almost no) relationship between the leadership styles and teachers performance. This means that other factors are responsible for teachers' performance. Regression reveals that transformational leadership positively predicts the teachers' performance, whereas transactional leadership is insignificant predictor of teachers' performance.

VII. Recommendation

The finding that there is a very small relationship between leadership style and teachers' performance implies that leadership styles considered here (transformational and transactional) has less influence on teachers' performance. Hence, the study recommends that other styles of leadership should be employed.

The finding that transformational leadership is a significant a positive predictor suggests that it is an important factor of teachers' performance. Therefore, the study recommends that transformational leadership style should be emphasized in the administration of school.

On the other hand, the finding that transactional leadership did insignificantly predict teacher performance leads to the assumption that it is not a very important factor in the effort to promote performance.

Reference

- [1]. Abba, H.D., Anumaka, I.B., & Gaité, S.S. (2016). Leadership Practices and Productivity of Academic Staff in Polytechnics in Nigeria. *American Journal of Academic Research*, 1, A56-A68 <http://www.asraresearch.org/ajar-vol-1-no-2-2016/>
- [2]. Abwalla, J. (2014). The Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Performance in Secondary Schools of Gambella Regional State; An Unpublished Manuscript, Jimma University, Ethiopia.
- [3]. Adeyemi, T.O. (2006). *Fundamentals of Educational Management*. Lagos: Atlantic Associated Publishers. pp. 21-60.
- [4]. Adepoju, T.L. (1996). The Factors Militating Against Effective Planning and Implementation of Educational Policies in Nigeria. *A Paper Presented at the WAEC Monthly Seminar, WAEC National Secretariat Yaba, Lagos.*

- [5]. Al-Baradie, R. S. (2014). Encouraging the Heart. *International Journal of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 1(1), 11-16.
- [6]. Bolden, R., Golsling, J., Marturano, A. and Dennison (2003). A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks; Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter, UK <http://www.leadershipstudies.com>
- [7]. Burn J. M. (2003). Transforming leadership, New York N. Y. Grove Press.
- [8]. Akinyemi.A. (1993). *Job Satisfaction Among Teachers in Ondo State Secondary School*. Journal of Education Leadership, (29) 10-22.
- [9]. Ezenwa, L. (2005). *Issues in Educational Management*. Enugu-Hipuks Additional Press.
- [10]. House, R. J. & Terrence, R. M. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership, journal of contemporary business vol. 5, 1974, pg. 81-97.
- [11]. Ibukun, W.O. (1997): Educational Management Theory and Practice, Ado-Ekiti Banigboye and Co. Press (Nig.) Ltd.
- [12]. Ijaiya NY. (2000). "Failing Schools" and National Development: Time for Reappraisal of School Effectiveness in Nigeria" *Niger. J. Edu. Res. Evaluation*, pp. 16- 42.
- [13]. Meindl, J.R. (1995). *The romance of leadership as follower - centric – theory: a social constructionist approach*. Leadership Quart, 6(3): 330-331.
- [14]. Obilade, S.O. (1999). *Leadership Qualities and Styles. As They Relate to Instructional Productivity*. The Manager Ibadan: Department of Educational Management, University of Ibadan, pp. 25-32.
- [15]. Obiwuru, T. C., Okwu, A. T., Akpa, V. O., & Nwankwere, I. A. (2011). Effects of leadership style on organisational performance: A survey of selected small scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu council development area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(7), 100-111.
- [16]. Ojokuku, R. M., Odetayo, T. A., & Sajuyigbe, A. S. (2012). Impact of leadership style on organisational performance: a case study of Nigerian banks. *American Journal of Business and Management*, 1(4), 202-207.
- [17]. Okeniyi C.M. (1995). *Relationship Between Leadership Problems and School Performance in Oyo State Secondary Schools*. Unpublished. M.Ed. Thesis University of Ibadan. pp. 57-82.
- [18]. Omolayo B. (2000) Psychology of human being at work (An introduction) Ado – Ekiti: crown house publication pp.12-20.
- [19]. Paracha, M. U., Qamar, A., Mirza, A., Hassan, I., & Waqas, H. (2012). Impact of leadership style (transformational & transactional leadership) on employee performance & mediating role of job satisfaction: Study of private school (educator) in Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 12(4), 55-64.
- [20]. Pradeep, D. D., & Prabhu, N. R. V. (2011). The relationship between effective leadership and employee performance. *Journal of Advancements in Information Technology*, 20, 198-207.
- [21]. Robert, H. and H. Tim, (1998). *Essential Manager's Manual*. A korkling Kindersley Book. Colour Scan, Singapore.
- [22]. SEGUN-ADENIRAN, CHIDI DEBORAH, "Leadership Styles and Job Productivity of University Library Staff: Interrogating the Nexus" (2015). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Pp. 1269.
- [23]. Shamaki, E. B. (2015). Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher's Job Productivity in Public Secondary Schools in Taraba State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*. ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online) .Vol.6, No.10.
- [24]. Singh, K. (2015). Leadership style and employee productivity: A case study of Indian banking organisations. *Journal of Knowledge Globalization*, 8(2), 39-67.
- [25]. Thamrin, H. M. (2012). The Influence of Transformational Leadership and Organisational Commitment on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 3(5), 566-572.
- [26]. Ukeje, B.O. (1999). *The Education of Teachers for a New Social Order*, The Nigeria Teacher.
- [27]. Waldman, D. A., Ramirez, G. G., House, R.J., & Puranam, P. (2001). Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 134-143.
- [28]. M.o.E. (1994). *The Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA

Wakkala G.T. "Leadership Styles and Teachers Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Yauri Local Government, Kebbi State, Nigeria." *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 12(05), (2022): pp. 54-60.