# Development of a Training Module for Administrative Leadership and Decision Making in State Higher Education Institutions

Napoleon B. Marasigan III, DM
Aklan State University, Banga, Aklan, Philippines
Corresponding Author e-mail: *nbmarasigan@asu.edu.ph*

*Abstract*

**Aim:** This research aimed to find out the extent of administrative leadership and decision making (ALDM) practices and the least mastered topics of the respondents on leadership and decision-making as bases for the development and evaluation of training module in ALDM.
**Methodology:** This study, which was carried out based on evaluation research design, utilized the ADDIE model in the development of the training modules. The quantitative results were subjected to descriptive statistics which were mean scores, standard deviations, and ranks.   The respondents in the analysis phase were the 35 permanent personnel of SUCs in Panay and there were 14 tryout participants in the implementation phase.
**Results:** The seven areas under the ALDM were generally perceived to be highly practiced by the respondents from the total rating of "Highly Practiced." This shows that even though the respondents do not hold top management designations, they already demonstrated to a substantial extent their knowledge and skills necessary for a leader. The entirety of the training module was remarkably accepted as "excellent" by the tryout participants and experts.
**Conclusion:** It can be concluded that the developed training module is an effective and suitable training material to augment any training in ALDM.

*Keywords:* administrative leadership, decision making, training module, module development

## INTRODUCTION

Everyday people in leadership positions are faced with decision making challenges. Leadership and decision making are essential skills and tool for most business operations. The continuity and durability of every organization depends on the way their leadership leaders make decisions that affect everyone in the business. According to Marsh et al. (2018), these resolutions and choices are the ones leading to significant commitment of resources, with important impact on the firm as a whole and its long-term performance.

Leaders in higher education must ensure they coach/mentor their faculty to empower faculty, academic, and administrative staff to develop leadership skills (Varada, 2022). Today, embracing continuous professional development is critical for faculty members, academic staff, and even graduate school students to survive and succeed. On the other hand, the success of employee training programs depends on the efficiency of the training content. If the training material is not compelling and well-constructed, the training program loses its effectiveness. Training materials provide on-demand support to the employees/participants – the future leaders and administrators – to enable departmental functions in the absence of key employees, and deliver valuable information during new hire onboarding.

As there was no study conducted on the development of a training module, the study pursued the direction of the development of a training module based on the results on the extent of practices on administrative leadership and decision making of the participants and their least mastered topics on the stated topics to address the scantiness if not the unavailability of validated training materials to supplement and strengthen professional development

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

trainings such as in the scope of administrative leadership and decision making specifically for state institutions of higher learning.

## Objectives

The study aimed to determine the extent of administrative leadership and decision making practices and the least mastered topics of respondents in Administrative Leadership and Decision Making (ALDM) as bases for the development of a training module.

Specifically, this study has the following objectives:

1. Determine the administrative leadership and decision making practices among the respondents;
    1.1 determine the extent of administrative leadership and decision making practices among the respondents;
    1.2 determine the respondents' least mastered topics in administrative leadership and decision making;
2. Development of the training module in administrative leadership and decision making based on the leadership and decision making practices to cater the least mastered topics of the respondents;
3. Determine how acceptable is the developed training module as evaluated by experts; and
4. Evaluation of the participants on the training module in administrative leadership and decision making.

## METHODS

### Research Design

The study was carried out based on evaluation research design which, according to Kellaghan (2010), is a form of disciplined and systematic inquiry that is carried out to ascertain an assessment or appraisal of an object, material, program, practice, activity, or system to specify information that will be of use in decision making. Disciplined and systematic inquiry is described in terms of the quantitative and qualitative methods or a combination of both of the behavioral and social sciences.

The model of development and evaluation of the training module in this research was the ADDIE development model. The acronym ADDIE stands for Analyze, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation. Originally, ADDIE is used as a framework in designing and developing educational and training programs (Molenda, 2015). This model can be used for various forms of product development in education.

### Population and Sampling

Three groups of participants took part in this study.

Firstly, the 35 personnel of State Institutions of Higher Learning (SIHL) from the seven State Colleges and Universities (SUCs) in Panay, Visayas, Philippines. They were determined using the purposive sampling due to the wide scope of data gathering considering the geographical locations of state universities in Panay. These 35 personnel are employed in a SIHL in permanent status. Secondly, the Experts. evaluated the training module before the implementation. Two experts in public management/administration and two experts in instructional material development and evaluation composed the experts. Lastly, the tryout pparticipants. They utilized the training module, and they also evaluated the material. The participants were 14 comprising of 13 graduate school students enrolled for the degree Master of Public Administration (MPA) in Second Semester of Academic Year 2022-2023, and their (1) subject professor.

### Instrumentation

There were three research instruments used in the study: (1) Researcher-made Interview Schedule to gather the comments and experiences of the participants in utilizing the training module; (2) Researcher-made Test on Administrative Leadership and Decision Making Practices; and (3) Generic Instrument for the Review, Evaluation, and Approval for the Use of Any Instructional Materials. The second instrument was a validated test validated by the two experts in public management/administration and by one expert in test construction. On the other hand, the third instrument was adopted with permission from the University Policy and Guidelines Manual for the Preparation, Evaluation, and Approval for Utilization of the Instructional Materials Produced by the faculty of Aklan State University. The instruments underwent a reliability test with a Chronbach alpha coefficient of .975. The ideal results of Cronbach alpha coefficient of a scale should be above 0.7. According to Pallant (2001, in Haro, 2019), higher

values indicate greater reliability in the test instruments. Further, the third instrument was reviewed by the University Instructional Materials Development Committee and was found appropriate to use to validate any instructional material such as the training module.

### Ethical Consideration

In general, the dignity and well-being of all participants involved – respondents, experts, and tryout participants – were protected at all times, and all of the research data remained confidential throughout the study. All participants are required to provide written informed consent. The participants were approached individually, online, and/or personally, and explained the purpose of the study and data collection process. They were given an appropriate time to ask questions and address any concerns. It was explained that as their participation was voluntary, refusing to participate or withdraw from the study while it in progress would not affect their job, education/studies in their respective institutions in any way.

The anonymity and confidentiality of all participants were preserved by not revealing their names and identity in the data collection, analysis, and reporting of the research findings.

### Data Collection

The researcher determined the extent of the leadership and decision-making practices and the least mastered topics on ALDM of the 35 SIHL Personnel in the analysis phase of the ADDIE model. Before the administration of the researcher-made test, the researcher sent a letter of permission/request to each respondent through e-mail and Messenger. On the other hand, product evaluation results were taken from experts and tryout participants' scores on acceptability of the training module.

### Data Analysis

After the administration of the test in the analysis phase, the data were checked, segregated according to topic and content, tallied using frequency score, and ranked. Meanwhile, the data collected after the administration of the test in the evaluation phase, were checked, tallied using frequency score, and ranked.

### RESULTS and DISCUSSION

### Profile of Respondents

Table 1 shows the profile of 35 personnel on permanent status in state institutions of higher learning in Panay, Visayas. There were five respondents from each state university. The 35 personnel included two associate professor V, one associate professor IV, three associate professor II, five associate professor I, four assistant professor IV, two assistant professor III, five assistant professor II, five assistant professor l, two instructor III, three instructor II, and three instructor I.

**Table 1**
***Profile of the Respondents***

| State University & College (SUC) | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| SUC A | 5 | 14.29 |
| SUC B | 5 | 14.29 |
| SUC C | 5 | 14.29 |
| SUC D | 5 | 14.29 |
| SUC E | 5 | 14.29 |
| SUC F | 5 | 14.29 |
| SUC G | 5 | 14.29 |
| TOTAL | 35 | 100% |

**Academic Rank**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Associate Professor V | 2 | 5.71 |
| Associate Professor IV | 1 | 2.85 |
| Associate Professor III | - | - |
| Associate Professor II | 3 | 8.57 |
| Associate Professor I | 5 | 14.28 |
| Assistant Professor IV | 4 | 11.42 |
| Assistant Professor III | 2 | 2.71 |
| Assistant Professor II | 5 | 14.28 |
| Assistant Professor I | 5 | 14.28 |
| Instructor III | 2 | 2.71 |
| Instructor II | 3 | 8.57 |
| Instructor I | 3 | 8.57 |
| TOTAL | 35 | 100% |

**Extent of Administrative Leadership and Decision Making Practices of the Respondents**

Table 2 shows the extent of administrative leadership and decision making practices of the 35 Personnel of state institutions of higher learning (SIHL) with an overall rating of "Highly Practiced" ($M$ = 3.96, $SD$ = .433). Results in most of the domains have the extent of "Highly Practiced" in the following: practicing ethical decision making ($M$ = 4.00, $SD$ = .685), making decision making accordingly ($M$ = 3.91, $SD$ = .742), developing self and others ($M$ = 3.85, $SD$ = .610), leading with flexibility ($M$ = 3.54, $SD$ = .610), and managing state institutions of higher learning ($M$ = 3.42, $SD$ = .608).

**Table 2**
***Results of the Extent of Administrative Leadership and Decision Making Practices of the Respondents***

| Indicator | SD | M | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Applying the foundations of leadership | .815 | 4.65 | Extremely Practiced |
| Enabling leadership | .490 | 4.37 | Extremely Practiced |
| Practicing ethical decision making | .685 | 4.00 | Highly Practiced |
| Making decision making accordingly | .742 | 3.91 | Highly Practiced |
| Developing others and self | .355 | 3.85 | Highly Practiced |
| Leading with flexibility | .610 | 3.54 | Highly Practiced |
| Managing state institutions of higher learning | .608 | 3.42 | Highly Practiced |
| *Overall Rating* | .433 | 3.96 | Highly Practiced |

*Note:* Description is based on the following scale. 4.20-5.00: Extremely Practiced; 3.20-4.19: Highly Practiced; 2.60-3.39: Practiced; 1.80-2.59: Somewhat Practiced; 1:00-1.79 Not Practiced

**Respondents' Least Mastered Topics in Administrative Leadership and Decision Making (ALDM)**
Table 3 shows the results of the 35 respondents' least mastered topics in ALDM. Out of seven major topics as expressed through the different areas in the extent of ALDM practices, *developing self and others*, *leading with*

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

*flexibility*, and *managing of state institutions of higher learning* ranked the least bottom three – fifth, sixth, and seventh respectively. Thus, these three least mastered topics were used as the content topics for the developed training module in ALDM.

**Table 3**
**Respondents' Least Mastered Topics in Administrative Leadership and Decision Making**

| Topics | M | SD | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| Managing state institutions of higher learning (*Administrative leadership*) | .608 | 3.42 | 7 |
| Leading with flexibility (*Styles of leadership*) | .610 | 3.54 | 6 |
| Developing self and others (*Leadership competencies*) | .355 | 3.85 | 5 |
| Making decision making accordingly (*Process of decision making*) | .742 | 3.91 | 4 |
| Practicing ethical decision making (*Ethical decision making*) | .685 | 4.00 | 3 |
| Enabling leadership (*Enabling leadership*) | .490 | 4.37 | 2 |
| Applying the foundations of leadership (*Models and theories of leadership*) | .815 | 4.65 | 1 |

**The Training Module Based on the Leadership and Decision Making Practices to Cater the Least Mastered Topics of the Respondents**

**Designing the Training Module.** After determining the topics to be modularized, the researcher structured the training module. The researcher structured the content whether the end-user may be as the trainer or as the trainee. In the process of developing the training module in ALDM, outlined procedures were adopted to achieve the purpose of this study. In determining the design of each training module, the researcher decided to adopt the institutionalized format used for any instructional materials development in the university where he is now connected.

The adapted format has now the following parts: (1) Title, (2) Scope, (3) Objectives, (4) Introduction (4) Discussion of Topics, (6) Self-Check Test, (8) Reflection Time, (9) Training Activities, and (10) References.

**Development of the Training Module ALDM Based on the Design.** In the Analysis Phase, the contents of the training module were identified, while in the Design Phase, the researcher decided to adapt the institutionalized format for IM development of Aklan State University (ASU) and this served as the framework of each training module that comprised the training module. These determined the criteria set forth the development of the training module.

**Evaluation Results for the Developed Training Module in Administrative Leadership and Decision Making (ALDM) as Evaluated by the Tryout Participants**

Data in Table 4 reveal the level of acceptability of the developed training module in ALDM based on the evaluation of the participants with the rating of "Excellent" acceptability ($M = 4.97$; $SD = .015$). Results of each area of evaluation were also excellent in the following areas: physical aspects ($M = 4.97$; $SD = .069$), contents ($M = 5.0$; $SD = .000$), objectives ($M = 4.96$; $SD = .035$), instruction ($M = 4.98$; $SD = .031$), learning activities, ($M = 4.96$; $SD = .028$), and evaluative measures ($M = 4.97$; $SD = .038$).

The overall findings essentially showed that the developed training module in ALDM is self-motivating particularly for the participants. The training module contains self-teaching and self-learning materials which enable

256

| | |
|---|---|
| ETCOR's Website | : https://etcor.org |
| Facebook Page | : https://www.facebook.com/EmbracingTheCultureOfResearch |
| Twitter Account | : https://twitter.com/ETCOR_research |
| YouTube Channel | : https://tinyurl.com/YouTubeETCOR |
| E-mail Address | : embracingthecultureofresearch@etcor.org |
| Mobile Number | : 0939-202-9035 |

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

the participants to work independently with minimum "trainer" assistance considering that the participants were given ample time for self-training using the training module.

**Table 4**
***Evaluation Results for the Developed Training Module in ALDM as Evaluated by***
***Tryout Participants***

|  |  | SDM | Evaluation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Physical Aspects | .069 | 4.97 | Excellent |
| Contents | .000 | 5.0 | Excellent |
| Objectives | .035 | 4.96 | Excellent |
| Instruction | .031 | 4.98 | Excellent |
| Learning Activities | .028 | 4.96 | Excellent |
| Evaluative Measures | .038 | 4.97 | Excellent |
| *Overall Ratings* | .015 | 4.97 | Excellent |

*Note:* Description is based on the following scale. 4.51-5.00: Excellent; 3.51-4.50: Very Good; 2.51-3.50: Good; 1.51-2.50: Fair; 1.00-1.50: Poor

**Evaluation Results for the Developed Training Module in Administrative and Decision Making as Evaluated by the Experts**

Data in Table 5 reveal the level of acceptability of the developed training module based on the evaluation of the experts with the overall rating of "Excellent" ($M$ = 4.70; $SD$ = .504). The results of the evaluation were also excellent in the following areas: physical aspects ($M$ = 4.66; $SD$ = .557), contents, $M$ = 4.75; $SD$ = .394), objectives, ($M$ = 4.55; $SD$ = 900), instruction ($M$ = 4.91; $SD$ = .098), learning activities ($M$ = 4.73; $SD$ = 308), and evaluative measures ($M$ = 4.6; $SD$ = 676).

The results ©ndicated that (a) the objectives, materials, and activities were properly and logically sequenced – specific, observable, measurable, and attainable; (b) the training module was written in a clear, correct, and simple language within the full comprehension of the participants; (c) the training module was developed to help the participants improve their critical thinking, creativity, and wise judgment; (d) and, the training module was well prepared containing all the necessary components.

These findings validate what Wentling (2016) stated that an effective training material depend on the well-defined training objective that will keep all involved on the right track throughout the training. They provide an important link between the needs assessment and the design and preparation of the training materials. The trainer can assess if the objectives were met, indicating whether the training was successful in meeting (Bouchrika, 2023).

Furthermore, it is likewise important to mention that among the six areas of evaluation, content area ranked 1 on the acceptability level on the acceptability level. The participants find the contents of the training module suitable and appropriate at present time, where an effective leadership has crucial role in our society today considering that the challenges and developments are keep on coming because leaders can pave the way for the society's success in one direction or another.

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

**Table 5**
*Summary of the Results of Acceptability of the Training Module in Administrative and Decision Making as Evaluated by Experts*

|  | Evaluator | | | | *SDM* | Evaluation | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |
| Physical Aspects | 4.83 | 5.0 | 3.84 | 5.0 | .557 | 4.66 | Excellent | 4 |
| Contents | 4.83 | 5.0 | 4.17 | 5.0 | .395 | 4.75 | Excellent | 2 |
| Objectives | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.2 | 5.0 | .900 | 4.55 | Excellent | 5 |
| Instruction | 4.83 | 5.0 | 4.83 | 5.0 | .098 | 4.91 | Excellent | 1.5 |
| Learning Activities | 4.83 | 5.0 | 4.83 | 5.0 | .098 | 4.91 | Excellent | 1.5 |
| Evaluative Measures | 4.83 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 5.0 | .676 | 4.6 | Excellent | 3 |
| *Section Mean* | 4.85 | 5.0 | 3.98 | 4.97 | .504 | 4.70 | Excellent | |

*Note:* Description is based on the following scale. 4.51-5.00: Excellent; 3.51-4.50: Very Good; 2.51-3.50: Good; 1.51-2.50: Fair; 1.00-1.50: Poor

## Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The main aim of this study is to determine the administrative leadership and decision-making (ALDM) extent of practices and the least mastered topics of the respondents on leadership and decision making as bases for the development of training module in ALDM. Furthermore, this study also measured the acceptability of the training modules as evaluated by the experts and participants.

Even though the personnel of state institutions of higher learning (SIHL) do not hold top management designations, they already demonstrated to a substantial extent their knowledge and skills on the process of evaluating and choosing among various approaches of decision making in a manner consistent with ethical principles when it comes to ethical decision making. SIHL personnel highly practiced the continuous self-development and also helping others not just themselves. This means that the personnel realized that leadership character is also building relationships and adding value to others, and the true leader must be able to embrace change and use it in ways that benefit the growth and sustainability of the organization.

The administrative leadership is the least mastered topic as the respondents were from the academe and office staff and do not hold any top management designations. On the other hand, the entirety of the developed training modules in ALDM has adequately covered all the aspects of the instruction and the quality of work is superior. The developed training module in ALDM is an effective training material to augment any trainings in leadership and decision making. The respondents may want to learn more about administrative leadership and decision making to be truly be an effective leader someday as leadership in any organization is important, but developing good leaders in the public sector is especially crucial because today's public sector leaders are being asked to function with fewer resources and continually find new ways to tackle challenges. It important for every government employee to be leadership skill-equipped and capable.

State institutions of higher learning may conduct annual review of their development and training plans to ensure that the needs of the personnel are properly and timely addressed and may consider that a comprehensive training program might include the training for new staff who have never done the particular work before and training for new staff who may be experienced in the work of the position, but not in the particular method or style which organization uses. The review may also look into trainings if these are planned generally for all the personnel to provide them with human relations skills so they can courteously and effectively serve the public, work harmoniously' and efficiently with other employees; to improve practices in their professional, technical, and clerical fields; and to enable them to develop and realize their own potential. They may also consider offering short-term government courses and workshops which shall be designed not only for public administrators and civic leaders but

258

ETCOR's Website : https://etcor.org
Facebook Page : https://www.facebook.com/EmbracingTheCultureOfResearch
Twitter Account : https://twitter.com/ETCOR_research
YouTube Channel : https://tinyurl.com/YouTubeETCOR
E-mail Address : embracingthecultureofresearch@etcor.org
Mobile Number : 0939-202-9035

*Thank you for embracing the culture of research with us!*

also for those interested employees from any organizations; the program may consist of modular public administration courses developing managerial performance in the key administration functions.

## REFERENCES

Bouchrika, I. (2023). *Training industry statistics: 2023 data, trends & predictions*. https://research.com/careers/training-industry-statistics

Haro, I. (2019). *Competencies and employability skills of Bachelor of Industrial Technology Students: Bases for the development of instructional materials*. [Unpublished Dissertation], West Visayas State University, Iloilo City.

Kellaghan, T. (2010). *Evaluation research*. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780080448947013269

Marsh, P., Barwise, P., Thomas, K., & Wensley, R. (2018). *Managing strategic investment decisions in large diversified companies*. London Business School: Center for Business Strategy

Molenda, M. (2015). *In search of the elusive ADDIE Model*. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pfi.21461

Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows version 10*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Varada, M. (2022). *Importance of leadership in higher education.* https://www.highereducationdigest.com/importance-of-leadership-in-higher-education/

Villanueva, K.F.P.A., Villanueva, A.A., Lasig, D.U., Esteban, R.B. and Cuaresma, M.L.M. (2019). *Assessing the managerial skills and decision-making ability of the local chief executives: The case of the third district of Nueva Ecija*. 6: e5899. https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1105899

Wentling, T.L. (2016). *Planning for effective training: A guide to curriculum development*. FAO, Rome.

Western, S. (2019). *Leadership: A critical text*. SAGE Publications Limited: Thousand Oaks, CA,USA.

Wong, S.I., Giessner, S.R. (2018). The thin line between empowering and laissez-faire leadership: An expectancy-match perspective. *J. Manag.*, *44*, 757–783.

Yukl, G.A. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations*; Pearson Education: New Delhi, India.

Yusuf, N. R. W. N. (2021). Impact of human resource development on public service through employee performance of Center Mamuju. *Urnal Ad'ministrare, 8*(1), 129–142.