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Abstract: This study examined the relationship between facilitators’ professional quality and learning outcomes in basic literacy programme in Sokoto State Nigeria. The objectives of the study were to determine the relationship between: i). Facilitators’ cognitive ability and learners’ learning outcomes in adult literacy programmes in Sokoto state; ii). Facilitators’ educational qualification and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state; iii). Facilitators’ methodology of teaching and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state; iv). Facilitators’ teaching experience and learning outcomes of adults in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. v). Facilitators’ quality and the learners’ learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. The hypotheses formulated and tested were: HO1: There is no significant relationship between the facilitators’ cognitive ability and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. HO2: There is no significant relationship between instructors’ educational attainment and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. HO3: There is no significant relationship between facilitator quality and the learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. Survey design was used for the study. The population of the study covered all adult literacy facilitators and learners in Sokoto State. The population of facilitators during the 2011/2012 session was 28 while that of the adult learners was 43575. The findings revealed that: There is no significant relationship between the instructors’ cognitive ability and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. Facilitators’ educational qualification relates positively with adult learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. Instructors’ methodology of teaching relates strongly and positively with adult learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. Instructors’ teaching experience relates positively with adult learning outcomes of Non-Formal learners in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. Facilitator quality relates positively and significantly with adult learners’ learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. Based on the above findings, the study made recommendations amongst which are the following: Employers of adult basic literacy instructors’ should encourage their instructors to go for in-service training to improve their educational qualification; Employers of adult basic literacy instructors should organize on the job training in the form of seminars/workshops for instructors’ of adult basic literacy programme with emphasis on improving their facilitation methodology. And lastly the study recommended that: Employers of adult basic literacy instructors should give incentives to experienced adult basic literacy instructors’ to remain on the job.

I. Introduction
Adult basic literacy is necessary in Nigeria to fight or eradicate illiteracy. This is particularly because Nigeria’s illiteracy rate is high (Olagunju, 2009). Olagunju (2009) reiterated that dealing with Nigeria’s burgeoning problem of illiteracy is much more a compulsion than a choice when he stated that “No nation on earth with even 20 per cent illiteracy level can become one of the top 20 economies in the world. But in the case of Nigeria, about 50 per cent are” (The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (2006) Education for All Global Monitoring Report puts Nigeria’s total adult literacy rate for adults aged 15 years and above as 48.7%. The rate for males was 59.4% while that of females was 38.4% Meanwhile between 2000-2004 the total literacy rate was put by UNESCO (2006) at 66.8% with that of males being 74.4% while that of females was 59.4%. Olagunju (2009) and Fasokun (2009) agreed that whatever the source of data used, Nigeria’s literacy rate is poor and stands to be a major obstacle against the realization of the development goals of the nation, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Vision 2020 project.

Globally, the number of full-time adult literacy instructors has declined by 48% since 1980 (Pugsley, 1990) as budget constraints persist. Additional concerns have been raised concerning the (a) lack of adequate regulation (Galbraith, 1985), (b) limited knowledge base (Cross, 1986), (c) numbers of instructors already in the field (Griffith, 1978), and (d) diversity of the teaching force (Galbraith & Gilley, 1985).
The adult education literature states that the success of an adult learning situation is predicated on several factors that involve both the learner and the educator (Beaudin and Kincaid, 1988; Galbraith, 1991). The educator is one of the most critical elements in the adult learning process.

There has been a substantial theoretical and practical shift of emphasis, mostly in mainstream education, towards acknowledging that facilitators are among the principal components of any educational programme. In the past ten years, a burgeoning research base has increasingly shown that facilitators are among the most important players influencing learner’s outcomes, holding the key to sealing the gaps in learners’ outcomes (Ferguson, 1991, 1998; Goldhaber, 2002; Sanders, 1998, 2000). Sanders (1998), for example, states that the “single largest factor affecting academic growth of population of learners is differences in effectiveness of individual classroom instructors (p. 27). Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997) also believe “more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of instructors than by any other single factor” (p. 63). Along the same lines, Alexander (2005) argues that “few educators, economists, or politicians argued with the contention that all things being equal, highly qualified instructors produce greater learner’s outcomes than comparatively less qualified instructors” (p. 2).

The National Report of Nigeria submitted by the National Commission for Mass Literacy, Adult and Non-Formal Education (NMEC) (2008) for CONFINTA VI supports this fact when it revealed that adult facilitators used various qualifications in facilitating adult learning and education in Nigeria. About 31.3% of them possessed only Post Literacy Certificates. About 23.5% of them possessed WAEC/NECO while 10.2% were Teachers Grade II certificate holders. The result further shows that 10.7% were holders of certificates in adult education; 9.0% were diploma holders; 9.9% were NCE holders, while 5.4% were graduates from the Universities. This situation for instance in sokoto Agency for Mass Education that has number of unqualified instructors; statistics show about 82% are not qualified to teach in our centers (Junaid 2012).

This researcher made efforts to determine the correlations of learner’s achievement with facilitator quality in the Non-formal education centers as such, the researcher was motivated to carry out this research to correlate facilitator’s quality with learner’s outcomes in literacy education centers using Sokoto State of Nigeria which is known to have the lower literacy rates among all states in Nigeria (National Literacy Survey conducted by the National Bureau of Statistics, 2010). It is against this bedrock that this study attempted to determine the relationship between facilitators quality and the learners learning outcome in non-formal basic literacy programme of Sokoto State.

The hypotheses formulated and tested were: HO₁: There is no significant relationship between the facilitators’ cognitive ability and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. HO₂: There is no significant relationship between facilitators’ educational attainment and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. HO₃: There is no significant relationship between the facilitators’ methodology of teaching and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. HO₄: There is no significant relationship between the facilitator’s teaching experience and learning outcomes of adults in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. HO₅: There is no significant relationship between facilitators' quality and the learners’ learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.

II. Methods

Survey design was used for the study. The population of the study covered all literacy facilitators and adult learners in Sokoto State. The population of facilitators during the 2011/2012 session was 28 while that of the learners was 43575. The instruments used for this study were: Classroom observation tool, Questionnaire and tests. This study also conducted two achievement tests: (i) facilitator subject area ability test and (ii) Non-Formal learners’ achievement/learning outcome test. The Classroom observation tool was used in this study to support hypothesis number 3 that whether there is a relationship between methodologies used in teaching Adults and the Adult learning outcome. The tests were carefully developed by the researcher using a test specification blue print and tested for reliability using test-retest. The reliability coefficient was 0.897.

The researcher also administered the tests to 28 schemes with the supports of research assistants covering 23 local governments this is to enable the study to correlate between the two major variables; learning outcome and facilitator’s professional quality. This study employed research assistants to support data collection in the area of classroom observations. The samples learning centres were selected by 3 senatorial districts; central had 3 LGAs while west and east had 2 LGAs a total of 28 Learning centres were used. The administration of the observation form was done after training the observers for a period of 10 days. The cognitive ability test was administered to 28 facilitators; these instructors are selected from those with NCE and Diplomas. The learner’s achievement test was administered to the all sampled learners.

The results from the data collected was presented in tables and analyzed using simple counts, frequencies and percentages and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was the statistical method used for hypotheses 1-4 while hypothesis 5 regression correlation was used. These procedures used were considered appropriate because Akuzuzulo and Agu (2004) stated that descriptive statistics of simple counts, frequencies and percentages exists to describe characteristics of a group or...
The focus of this study was to assess the relationship between facilitators’ quality and learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programme in Sokoto state. This was in terms of Instructors’ cognitive ability, educational qualification, methodology of teaching, teaching experience and quality with the learners’ learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. The appropriate statistics of descriptive statistics such as mean, ranking, percentage and standard deviation as well as Spearman's rank Correlation Coefficient. All the analyses and presentations are made according to the hypotheses postulated for the study.

**Hypothesis 1**

H1: There is no significant relationship between the instructors’ cognitive ability and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.

**Table 4.1: Relationship between Facilitators’ Cognitive Ability and learning Outcome from the selected Basic Literacy scheme/centers of Sokoto State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>ICogAT X Scores</th>
<th>ALO(y)</th>
<th>Calculated value</th>
<th>Tabulated Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
ICogAT - Instructors’ Cognitive Ability Test
ALO –Adult Learning Outcome
NS-No Significant Relationship

Table 4.1 reveals that the mean score obtained from the cognitive ability test score is 43.5 of the 28 literacy centers while the calculated value shows r = 0.268, the table value have 0.392. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between facilitators Cognitive Ability and learning outcome. The calculated value of 0.268 is less than the table value of 0.392 at 0.5 significance level, hence we accept of the null hypothesis

**Hypothesis 2**

H2: There is no significant relationship between facilitators’ educational qualification and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.

**Table 4.2 Relationship between Facilitators’ Qualification and Learning Outcome in Basic Literacy Programmes of Sokoto State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>X-IQ (x) (Q=1-6)</th>
<th>X-ALO(y)</th>
<th>Calculated value</th>
<th>Tabulated Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
IQ - Instructors’ Qualifications
ALO –Adult Learning Outcome
S- Significant Relationship

Findings shown in Table 4.2 above revealed that the dominant qualifications of the instructors is between 3.1 (category of non-education Diplomas’ to SSCE) and it also shows' that there is a significant correlation between instructors’ Qualification and Adults learners’ learning outcome, the calculated value of 0.545 is greater than the table value of 0.392 at a 0.5 significance level; therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Hypothesis 3**

H3: There is no significant relationship between the instructors’ methodology of teaching and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.

**Table 4.3: Relationship between Facilitators' Methodology of teaching and Outcome of the selected in basic literacy Centers in Sokoto State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>X-MT (x)</th>
<th>X-LO(y)</th>
<th>Calculated value</th>
<th>Tabulated Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
IMT - Instructors’ Method of Teaching
LO –Learning Outcome
S- Significant Relationship
Table 4.3 reveals that there is a positive correlation $r = 0.571$ between instructors methodology of teaching and Adult learners’ learning outcome. Therefore there is a significant relationship between instructors’ methodology of instructions and adult learning outcome. The calculated value of 0.581 is greater than the table value of 0.392 at 0.5 significance level hence the rejection of the null hypothesis.

It should be recalled observation instruments was used in the study the data presented in respect of each of these categories and their sub categories, as we try to describe instructor’s teaching practices and Adult learners’ learning practices by doing this, it will determine what strategy instructors are using in facilitating/teaching strategy or methodology.

### Table 4.3.1 Classroom organization/structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  Work as whole class</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B  Working individually</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Work in pairs or groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the frequency counts of all the entries under the category of classroom structure in both instruments like instances when the observer shaded more than one of the sub categories or did not shade any one of the categories. The evidence in the table shows that teachers in the state organised learners as a whole class for over three quarters of the class time (77%); about one-fifth (17%) was spent on individual work and 5% on pair or group work.

This category of behaviour (classroom structure) in the two observation instruments allows for three sub categories labelled A, B, and C representing work as whole class, working individually and work in pairs or groups respectively. The literature on classroom structure posits the three structures as necessary for different purposes during classroom instruction. The whole class arrangement leaves the teachers with the posture of a sage on the stage which is a feature of teacher centred teaching. The arrangement does not provide the variety associated with learner centred teaching. However, there are instances of the lesson when it is appropriate, but it should not be mostly used. Working individually provides opportunities for learners to work as individuals. Apart from promoting self-reliance, this structure in a class improves learners’ problem solving skills, as well as process and analytical skills. In fact this call for need to Andragogical approach to adult teaching and learning, thus; it permits working in pairs or groups is which is very helpful in the promotion of learners’ interpersonal skills and relations. It is important not only for improving learners’ cognitive and social skills, but also in building communal relationships.

In analyzing this instructor talks in instructional strategy, we account the frequency of occurrence of each of the sub categories under instructor’s verbal communication was conducted. The frequencies were then transposed into proportions for ease of comparison, as shown in Table 4.6 below.

### Table 4.3.2 Observed facilitator talks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sub category</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tells/informs/Explains</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Talks to individual or group of learners</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Leads chanting</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Asks closed question</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Asks open question</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Provides feedback</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Answers learner(s) question</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Praises learner(s)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Reprimands learner(s)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Distracted</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence in the above table shows that little or no interaction was observed between facilitators and adult learners in 16 schemes 115 centres. Given that the best way to establish the amount of facilitator talks as opposed to learners’ talk is to consider the proportion of instructor silence. The worst case scenario was that the learners were talking during this time. For more than half of the instructors’ talks is chanting (say after me) (55%), this characteristic signifies that instructors lack planned strategy to use in lesson delivery. The instructors were also found talking at the learners either informing or explaining to whole learners.

To describe how instructors’ talks to initiate and follow up on learners thoughts and learning by using such moves is elicited and provided by Brodie (2005) were talks are highly dominated by the teachers and are
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mostly in low capacity teachers. These patterns of teacher communication in class do not promote intellectual growth or learners’ proficiency.

**Hypothesis 4**

$H_0^4$: There is no significant relationship between the facilitator’s teaching experience and learning outcomes of learners in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.

**Table 4.4:** Relationship between Facilitators’ Years of experience and Adults Learning Outcome of the selected adult basic literacy Centers of Sokoto State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>IYE (x)</th>
<th>CE (1-3)</th>
<th>Calculated value</th>
<th>Tabulated Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

IYE - Instructors’ years of experience (1=0-4yrs 2=5-10yrs 3=11-above)

CE - Count of Experience

S- Significant Relationship

As indicated in table 4.4 data showed that the dominant place of instructors working experience is in between 1-2 (1.76) (1=0-4years, 2=5-10years, 3=10 above years) furthermore it also showed that there is a positive correlation $r = 0.581$ between instructors’ years of experience and Adult learners’ learning outcome. Therefore there is a significant relationship between instructors’ years of experience and adult learning outcome. The calculated value of 0.581 is greater than the table value of 0.392 at 0.5 significance level, hence the rejection of the null hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 5**

$H_0^5$: There is no significant relationship between the facilitator’s professional quality and adult learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.

**Table 4.5** Regression analysis of the facilitators professional Quality and the aggregate performance score.

From table 5, which regression linear chart was used, it could be seen that the direction of linear show’s significant relationship, the moved towards measure of instructor professional quality site. One will generally say instructor professional quality matters to learning outcome. Hence it could be inferred that there is a positive relationship between instructor quality and adult learners’ outcomes in basic literacy programme in Sokoto State.

**IV. Discussion**

The first finding on the facilitator qualification revealed that the majority of the instructors in this study are non-education Diploma, SSCE and Basic Literacy Certificate holders taking about 75% of the total sampled instructors. Table 4 reveals that there is a relationship between instructors’ qualifications and learner learning outcome in adult basic education programme in Sokoto State. The calculated value of 0.504 is greater than the table value of 0.392 therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. This finding confirms Darling Hammond (2000) Egungun (1992) and Iyamu (2005) assertion that qualitative education is a function of quality personnel within a
system. The finding points out that “No Education System can rise above the quality of teachers in the system” as stated in the National Policy of Education (FGN, 2006). This, however, calls for putting in place necessary training for these instructors to prepare them to handle teaching and learning more effectively in the state Mass Literacy programme.

The finding on the issue of facilitators’ years of experience from the sampled basic literacy centers shows from a table indicated that 174 (53%) out of the total of 328 sampled facilitators’ fall in the category of 0-4 years of teaching experience. Ninety six instructors (27%) had between 6-10 years of teaching experience while 71 (21%) acquired 11 and above years of teaching experience. The calculated value of this correlation shows that $r = 0.581$ which is greater than the table value of 0.392 at 0.5 level of significance. This finding indicates that instructor’s years of experience is a measure of quality and thus becomes imperative in the achievement of adults’ learners learning outcome. This supports those who advocate that experienced instructors need to be retained in our learning centers if better productivity is to be obtained because learners achieved more from these instructors.

This finding confirms Owolabi (2007), Abraham and Keith (2006) and Darling Hammond (2000) who agree that teachers’ years of experience as a measure of quality is important in the achievement of students’ academic performance.

Charles et. al (2007) asserts’ that teacher experience has a significant positive effect on student achievement, with more than half of the gains occurring during the teacher’s first few years, but substantial gains occurring over subsequent years, albeit at a slower rate. In recent time also Darling Hammond (2012) reported in the same directions that while young teachers and the fresh ideas they can bring are essential to improve teaching effectiveness, experience always matters in teaching. Research clearly shows that with each year of experience, teachers improve their proficiency and effectiveness during the first seven years. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification demonstrates that many teachers are still gaining in proficiency and improving their effectiveness after an average of 11 years of teaching. The National Board teachers’ pursuit of a rigorous additional certification indicates that a subset of our most accomplished teachers continue to grow, and are eager for new professional challenges throughout their career.

The findings from the next hypothesis reveals there is significant relationship between Methodology of teaching and adults’ learner learning outcome in adult basic literacy programme, the result shows that $r = 0.571$ while the critical value was 0.392 by that we rejected the null hypothesis. That’s means positive relationship exit between teaching methodology and learning outcome in adult basic literacy programme in Sokoto State. This finding also agreed with the sampled instructors that lack of friendly approach such as andragogical model to adult teaching; from the report of the classroom observation affects good learning. Marzano, (2009) characterizes an effective teacher as one who matches the strategies to the best way to deliver his lesson. Also argued that literacy education is at a critical juncture where all kind of part-time instructors are recruited to teach adult learners who may lack preparation for an understanding of basic literacy and an ability to apply the skills into our daily live.

The finding on the facilitators’ cognitive ability no relationship between Instructors’ Cognitive Ability and Adult learners’ learning outcome, the calculated value of $r = 0.268$ was lower the critical table value at 0.5 level of significance of 0.392 this implies we accept the null hypothesis. That’s means that very intelligent and gifted individuals in mental ability as teachers/instructors are not likely to produce better learning outcome; this is really against the thinking of this researcher. Against my thoughts, Rachael (2008) reported from the teaching practice assessment that outstanding students in examinations are found not better in oral presentations and self-expression even though they may be having adequate knowledge and skills of subject area but also face difficulties in lesson delivery matter.

This discussion attests to all the previous findings that instructors’ competency in terms of quality is a great predictor of learning outcome in Nigerian mass education; 3 out of 4 hypothesis tested indicated significant relationship. The instructor is the keystone of quality.” Education research has continued to show that an effective instructor is the single most important factor of learning outcome. In related finding of the formal system of education, the preponderance of evidence concludes that effective teachers are capable of inspiring significantly greater learning gains in their students when compared with their weaker colleagues. Most of this evidence is based on “value added” analyses of large sets of data linking individual students’ test scores to their teachers. Such studies determine students’ average annual rates of improvement, as measured by test scores. They estimate how much value a teacher has contributed to student achievement, factoring in the gains the student was expected to make based on past performance, and in some cases, controlling for elements such as peer characteristics and background, including poverty level and family education.

The study examined the relationship between facilitators’ quality and learning outcomes in non-formal basic literacy programme in Sokoto State, Nigeria. This was in terms of the facilitators’ cognitive ability, educational qualification, methodology of teaching, as to how they relate the instructor quality and learning outcomes in literacy programmes in Sokoto state. In chapter two, The theoretical framework based on...
evaluation as an all-embracing holistic or systematic phenomenon developed by (Bhola 1989), was used to support this study. Related literature were reviewed and discussed. They were later summarized and this study’s uniqueness with other studies were highlighted. Consequently, the 328 instructors and 43575 adult learners during the 2011/2012 session as was given by the Sokoto State Agency for Mass Literacy, Adult and Non Formal Education were studied. Data were generated through the use of both Classroom observation tool and Questionnaire that contained four major areas: (a) Instructor classroom practices (b) Questionnaire and two achievement tests as instruments to assess: the instructor’s cognitive ability and adult learner achievement/learning outcome. Analyses were done using simple counts, frequencies and percentages. Pearson product moment correlation and regression analysis were used to test the hypotheses. The result of the data analysis established that:

- a) There is no significant relationship between the facilitators’ cognitive ability and learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.
- b) Facilitators’ educational qualification relates positively with adult learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state;
- c) Facilitators’ methodology of teaching relates strongly and positively with adult learners’ learning outcomes in basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state;
- d) Facilitators’ teaching experience relates positively with adult learning outcomes of adults in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.
- e) Facilitators’ quality relates positively and significantly with adult learners’ learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state.

V. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to establish the relationship between facilitators’ quality and learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programme in Sokoto State Nigeria. The study has revealed that there is a significant relationship between facilitators quality and learning outcomes in Non-Formal basic literacy programme in Sokoto State. All the variables tested such as facilitators educational qualification, methodology of teaching, teaching experience, relates significantly with adult learners’ learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programmes in Sokoto state. It is therefore not out of place for the N.P.E (2006) to have equivocally stated that no educational system can rise above the quality of its teachers.

VI. Recommendations

The following specific and general recommendations are made based on the findings of this study:

- a) Employers of Non-Formal basic literacy programmes facilitators in Sokoto state through the Agency for mass education should not use ability tests results as a basis for recruitment of Facilitators;
- b) Employers of adult basic literacy facilitators and the Sokoto state government should encourage their facilitators to go for in-service training to improve their educational qualifications;
- c) Employers of non-formal basic literacy facilitators should organize on the job training in the form of seminars/workshops for facilitators of adult basic literacy programme with emphasis on improving their facilitation methodology.
- d) Employers of non-formal basic literacy instructors should give incentives to experienced adult basic literacy facilitators’ to remain on the job.
- e) Policy makers in Sokoto state should continue to emphasize on the need for instructor quality to improve learning outcomes in adult basic literacy programmes.
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