International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention 12(07): 8691-8702, 2025
DOI: 10.18535/ijsshi/v12i07.05
ISSN: 2349-2031
https://valleyinternational.net/index.php/theijsshi

The Influence of Leadership Skills and Decision-Making Styles on the Organizational Effectiveness of Academic Administrators in Selected Private Higher Educational Institutions

Dr. Madel Maquero Duff

STI College Cagayan de Oro

Abstract:

This study examined the influence of leadership skills and decision-making styles on the organizational effectiveness of academic administrators in selected private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines. Grounded in Structural-Functionalism and the Power and Influence framework, the research utilized a descriptive-correlational design involving 148 faculty members as respondents. Data were collected using validated questionnaires and analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson r, ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis.

Findings revealed that academic administrators demonstrated high levels of conceptual, human, and technical leadership skills, as well as a preference for analytical decision-making styles. Among the leadership skills, conceptual and technical skills significantly predicted organizational effectiveness, particularly in areas such as general administration, human resource development, and academic program management. Analytical decision-making emerged as the only style with a significant positive impact on performance outcomes. Human leadership skills and behavioral, conceptual, and directive decision-making styles were not significant predictors.

The results underscore the importance of strategic thinking, innovation, technical adaptability, and data-driven decision-making in enhancing institutional effectiveness. A Structural-Functional Leadership Model was developed and validated using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), indicating a strong model fit. These findings provide empirical grounding for leadership development programs, institutional policy, and capacity-building initiatives in the higher education sector.

Keywords: **leadership skills, decision-making styles, organizational effectiveness, academic administrators, higher education.**

Introduction

Education is a key driver of national development and societal transformation. As emphasized by national hero Dr. José Rizal in *A La Juventud Filipina*, education is vital for liberating individuals from ignorance and preparing youth to contribute meaningfully to the nation. In this context, leadership in academic institutions plays a pivotal role in shaping educational outcomes and institutional success. Academic administrators, through their leadership skills and decision-making styles, significantly influence organizational effectiveness—impacting faculty performance, institutional culture, and the achievement of educational goals.

Effective leadership in education entails more than administrative competence; it requires the strategic application of conceptual, human, and technical skills to navigate complex, rapidly changing academic environments. Strong leadership fosters cohesive teams, supports professional development, and promotes data-informed decisions that improve organizational outcomes. Recent studies (e.g., Shrestha, 2019; Anicas, 2020; Khan, 2020) underscore the growing demand for academic leaders who are adaptive, collaborative, and capable of guiding institutions through challenges such as globalization, technological advancement, and health crises.

Despite the established link between leadership and institutional success, many higher education institutions (HEIs) still face difficulties in identifying and cultivating leadership competencies that lead to optimal performance. The lack of clarity regarding which leadership skills and decision-making styles most effectively influence organizational outcomes presents a gap in the literature. Furthermore, many institutions focus on student outcomes while neglecting the development of academic administrators and faculty leaders (Brunson, 2020). This study responds to that gap by exploring how different leadership skills and decision-making styles correlate with organizational effectiveness.

Guided by the Structural-Functionalism theory and supported by the Power and Influence framework, this study seeks to examine the interplay of leadership skills (conceptual, human, and technical) and decision-making styles (analytical, behavioral, conceptual, and directive) among academic administrators in selected private HEIs in Cagayan de Oro City. These variables are assessed for their influence on institutional effectiveness, specifically in the areas of general administration, human resource development, financial management, and academic program management.

Research Questions:

This study seeks to answer the following core question: *How do leadership skills and decision-making styles of academic administrators influence organizational effectiveness in selected private higher education institutions in Cagayan de Oro City?*

Supporting questions examine the relationships among leadership competencies, decision-making styles, demographic variables, and institutional performance indicators.

Purpose of the Study:

The main objective is to assess the extent to which leadership skills and decision-making styles influence organizational effectiveness. The findings aim to inform the development of a structural-functional leadership model for academic administrators, which can guide improvements in policy, training, and institutional governance.

Significance:

The results will benefit school administrators, academic leaders, faculty, HR departments, students, and the broader academic community by providing empirical data on effective leadership practices. In particular, it will help improve hiring processes, professional development programs, and leadership training initiatives in HEIs.
By identifying effective leadership profiles and decision-making approaches, this study contributes to the ongoing efforts to enhance educational leadership and, ultimately, the quality of higher education delivery in the Philippines.

Methods

Research Design

This study employed a **descriptive-correlational quantitative research design** to examine the influence of leadership skills and decision-making styles on the organizational effectiveness of academic administrators in selected private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Cagayan de Oro City. Both **primary and secondary data** were utilized. Primary data were collected through structured surveys and supplemented by interviews to validate selected findings.

Participants and Sampling Method

The respondents consisted of **148 faculty members** from five selected private HEIs in Cagayan de Oro City. They were chosen using **simple random sampling** from a population of 238 faculty members, ensuring equal opportunity for selection. The sample size was determined using the Raosoft sample size calculator with a **95% confidence level** and **5% margin of error**.

Inclusion criteria included:
(1) Current employment in one of the selected HEIs,
(2) At least one year of continuous service, and
(3) Informed consent provided via email.

These faculty members were selected as they work directly under the supervision of academic administrators, making them reliable sources for assessing leadership and organizational performance.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a **structured questionnaire** with two main sections:

- **Part I**: Respondents' demographic profile (sex, age, educational attainment, length of service)
- **Part II**: Assessment of academic administrators' leadership skills, decision-making styles, and organizational effectiveness.

The items on **leadership skills** were adapted from Jones (2006), while **decision-making styles** were based on Kraus (1998). The organizational effectiveness items were **researcher-developed**. Instruments were validated by three subject matter experts, and a **pilot test** involving 30 non-sample participants yielded acceptable reliability scores using **Cronbach's alpha** ($\alpha \geq 0.7$).

Data Gathering Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was sought from the administrators of participating institutions. Upon approval, online surveys were distributed to eligible faculty members. Respondents were briefed on the study's purpose and instructions before completing the survey. All participants voluntarily provided informed consent.

Ethical Considerations

The study ensured ethical compliance by:

- Securing informed consent from participants,
- Guaranteeing **anonymity** and **confidentiality** of responses,
- Allowing voluntary participation with the option to withdraw at any time.

Data Analysis

Collected data were encoded and analyzed using **SPSS software**. The following statistical tools were used:

- **Descriptive statistics**: Frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation to describe the demographic profile and assess responses.

- **Pearson r**: To examine the relationship between leadership skills and decision-making styles.
- **T-test and ANOVA**: To determine significant differences based on demographic profiles.
- **Regression analysis**: To test the influence of leadership skills and decision-making styles on organizational effectiveness.

Responses were quantified using a **four-point Likert scale**, interpreted as follows:

Scale	Range	Description	Interpretation
4	3.26–4.00	Great Extent	Always Perform
3	2.51–3.25	Moderate Extent	Almost Always Perform
2	1.76–2.50	Least Extent	Sometimes Perform
1	1.00–1.75	Not at All	Seldom Perform

Results

3.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 148 faculty respondents in terms of sex, age, highest educational attainment, and length of service.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	65	43.92%
Female	83	56.08%
Age		
21–25 years old	20	13.51%
26–30 years old	53	35.81%
31–35 years old	27	18.24%
36–40 years old	10	6.76%
41 years old and above	38	25.68%
Highest Educational Attainment		
Doctoral Degree	21	14.19%
Master's Degree	61	41.22%
Bachelor's Degree	66	44.59%
Length of Service		
1–5 years	76	51.35%
6–10 years	27	18.24%
11–15 years	15	10.14%
16–20 years	10	6.76%
21 years and above	20	13.51%

3.2 Assessment of Leadership Skills of Academic Administrators

Leadership skills were evaluated in three domains: **conceptual**, **human**, and **technical**. All domains were rated as being demonstrated to a **great extent** by academic administrators.

3.2.1 Conceptual Leadership Skills

Table 2. Mean Distribution of Conceptual Leadership Skills

Item	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Thinks creatively	3.32	0.70	Great extent
Identifies core issues/opportunities from information	3.33	0.67	Great extent
Understands the role of risk management	3.40	0.67	Great extent
Updated in current developments in learning and teaching	3.36	0.68	Great extent
Identifies new opportunities	3.46	0.65	Great extent

Item	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Average	**3.37**	0.68	**Great extent**

3.2.2 Human Leadership Skills

Table 3. Mean Distribution of Human Leadership Skills

Item	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Remains calm under pressure	3.45	0.71	Great extent
Understands the personal strengths and limitations of each one	3.34	0.73	Great extent
Listens to different points of view	3.48	0.75	Great extent
Transparent in dealing with others	3.43	0.73	Great extent
Promotes a collegial working environment	3.50	0.66	Great extent
Average	**3.44**	0.72	**Great extent**

3.2.3 Technical Leadership Skills

Table 4. Mean Distribution of Technical Leadership Skills

Item	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Assists faculty and staff in delivering needed changes	3.41	0.69	Great extent
Presides meetings objectively	3.33	0.77	Great extent
Uses IT effectively for communication and work functions	3.39	0.68	Great extent
Flexible and responsive in solving workplace issues	3.41	0.69	Great extent
Consults network of faculty/staff to solve workplace concerns	3.38	0.73	Great extent
Average	**3.38**	0.71	**Great extent**

Decision-Making Styles of Academic Administrators

Analytical Style

Respondents rated the analytical decision-making style of academic administrators to a **great extent**, with an overall mean of **3.45**. The highest-rated item was "Believes that the more information that is gathered, the better the decisions will be" (M = 3.49), while the lowest was "Gathers all relevant information including observation, facts, and figures" (M = 3.42).

Table 9: Mean Distribution of the Analytical Decision-Making Styles of Academic Administrators

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Gathers all relevant information	3.42	0.66	Great extent	Always perform
Weighs all the pros and cons	3.46	0.73	Great extent	Always perform
Believes more info = better decisions	3.49	0.71	Great extent	Always perform
Solicits perspectives from various sources	3.46	0.71	Great extent	Always perform
Values depth of information	3.43	0.67	Great extent	Always perform
Average	**3.45**	0.69	Great extent	Always perform

Behavioral Style

The behavioral decision-making style received an overall mean of **3.28**, interpreted as **great extent**. Two items fell under "moderate extent" – “Prefers to make choices which do not rock the boat” (M = 3.09) and “The feelings and desires of other people are weighed” (M = 3.17).

Table 10: Mean Distribution of the Behavioral Decision-Making Styles of Academic Administrators

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Weighs others’ feelings/desires	3.17	0.82	Moderate extent	Almost always perform
Decision benefits everyone	3.42	0.67	Great extent	Always perform

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Seeks input/feedback	3.41	0.70	Great extent	Always perform
Prioritizes relationships	3.29	0.78	Great extent	Always perform
Avoids rocking the boat	3.09	0.69	Moderate extent	Almost always perform
Average	**3.28**	0.73	Great extent	Always perform

Conceptual Style

The conceptual style was assessed at a **moderate extent** with an overall mean of **3.23**. Notably, "Aware of how their decision will affect others" received the lowest score of **2.69**.

Table 11: Mean Distribution of the Conceptual Decision-Making Styles of Academic Administrators

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Encourages open thinking/collaboration	3.41	0.72	Great extent	Always perform
Concerned with long-term effects	3.41	0.76	Great extent	Always perform
Aware of impact on others	2.69	1.03	Moderate extent	Almost always perform
Thinks outside the box	3.22	0.73	Moderate extent	Almost always perform
Considers big picture	3.44	0.65	Great extent	Always perform
Average	**3.23**	0.78	Moderate extent	Almost always perform

Directive Style

The directive style scored the lowest among all styles, with an overall mean of **2.95** (**moderate extent**). Items “Navigates situations without prior consultation” (M = 2.63) and “Prefers to take action alone” (M = 2.65) received the lowest ratings.

Table 12: Mean Distribution of the Directive Decision-Making Styles of Academic Administrators

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Relies on experience	2.96	0.90	Moderate extent	Almost always perform
Acts independently	2.65	0.95	Moderate extent	Almost always perform
Uses rules and procedures	3.36	0.58	Great extent	Always perform
Rational and level-headed	3.17	0.69	Moderate extent	Almost always perform
Navigates without consultation	2.63	0.91	Moderate extent	Almost always perform
Average	**2.95**	0.81	Moderate extent	Almost always perform

Administrative Performance of Academic Administrators

General Administration

The overall mean was **3.47**, which indicates that administrators were perceived to perform their general administrative duties to a **great extent**.

Table 13: Mean Distribution in Terms of General Administration

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Mastery of work demands	3.51	0.65	Great extent	Always perform
Uses democratic practices	3.52	0.63	Great extent	Always perform
Leads by example	3.49	0.62	Great extent	Always perform
Discusses issues objectively	3.41	0.67	Great extent	Always perform
Seeks advice and diverse opinions	3.40	0.67	Great extent	Always perform
Average	**3.47**	0.65	Great extent	Always perform

Human Resource Development

With an overall mean of **3.41**, academic administrators were rated at a **great extent** in managing human resources.

Table 14: Mean Distribution in Terms of Human Resource Development

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Recruitment and selection	3.38	0.70	Great extent	Always perform

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Support for capability dev't	3.41	0.69	Great extent	Always perform
Communicates performance expectations	3.49	0.64	Great extent	Always perform
Promotes inclusive culture	3.44	0.66	Great extent	Always perform
Builds industry linkages	3.31	0.69	Great extent	Always perform
Average	**3.41**	0.68	Great extent	Always perform

Financial Management

The mean score of **3.40** reflects that administrators are perceived to manage finances to a **great extent**.

Table 15: Mean Distribution in Terms of Financial Management

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Operates within budget	3.44	0.71	Great extent	Always perform
Ensures fund use for intended purpose	3.39	0.75	Great extent	Always perform
Allocates resources effectively	3.40	0.68	Great extent	Always perform
Supports programs/projects equitably	3.47	0.64	Great extent	Always perform
Monitors budget usage	3.31	0.76	Great extent	Always perform
Average	**3.40**	0.71	Great extent	Always perform

Academic Program Management

This category received the highest overall mean of **3.50**, indicating that administrators were perceived to manage academic programs to a **great extent**.

Table 16: Mean Distribution in Terms of Academic Program Management

Items	Mean	Std. Dev	Description	Interpretation
Programs are current and relevant	3.49	0.65	Great extent	Always perform
Updated on education trends	3.45	0.66	Great extent	Always perform
Fosters student achievement	3.49	0.66	Great extent	Always perform
Aligns curriculum with industry needs	3.56	0.65	Great extent	Always perform
Responds to faculty/student concerns	3.50	0.68	Great extent	Always perform
Average	**3.50**	0.66	Great extent	Always perform

Problem 5: Relationship Between Leadership Skills and Decision-Making Styles

To determine whether a significant relationship exists between academic administrators' leadership skills and their decision-making styles, Table 17 presents the computed **R-values** and **p-values**. In all instances, the **null hypothesis is rejected**, indicating statistically significant relationships.

- **Conceptual leadership skill** exhibited the **strongest relationship** with **analytical decision-making style** (R = .728, p = .000).
- Moderate relationships were observed between:
  - **Behavioral decision-making style** and both **conceptual (R = .680)** and **human (R = .688)** leadership skills.
- **Directive decision-making style** showed a **weak relationship** across all three leadership skills, with R-values ranging from **.361 to .394**.

Table 17: Significant Relationship Between Leadership Skills and Decision-Making Styles

Leadership Skills	Analytical (R)	p-value	Behavioral (R)	p-value	Conceptual (R)	p-value	Directive (R)	p-value
Conceptual	.728**	.000	.680**	.000	.636**	.000	.394**	.000
Human	.704**	.000	.688**	.000	.635**	.000	.367**	.000
Technical	.645**	.000	.578**	.000	.541**	.000	.361**	.000

Significant at $p < 0.05$

Problem 6: Difference in Leadership Skills Based on Respondents' Profile

Table 18 shows the comparison of respondents' assessment of academic administrators' leadership skills based on their demographic profile. A significant difference was found **only in age**, affecting:

- **Conceptual skills** (F = 2.899, p = .024)

- **Human skills** (F = 2.615, p = .038)

For **sex**, **educational attainment**, and **length of service**, **no significant differences** were found.

Table 18: Test of Difference in Leadership Skills Based on Respondents' Profile

Profile	Conceptual (p)	Decision	Human (p)	Decision	Technical (p)	Decision
Sex	.907	Accepted	.762	Accepted	.770	Accepted
Age	.024	Rejected	.038	Rejected	.053	Accepted
Educational Level	.895	Accepted	.986	Accepted	.753	Accepted
Length of Service	.269	Accepted	.356	Accepted	.076	Accepted

Significant at $p < 0.05$

Problem 7: Difference in Decision-Making Styles Based on Respondents' Profile

Sex

As shown in **Table 19**, there were **no significant differences** in decision-making style assessments based on sex.

Age

Table 20 shows significant differences in assessments based on age for:

- **Analytical** (F = 2.73, p = .032)
- **Behavioral** (F = 2.50, p = .045)
- **Directive** (F = 2.59, p = .039)

No significant difference was found for **conceptual** style (p = .141).

Educational Attainment and Length of Service

Tables 21 and 22 show that there were **no significant differences** in assessment of decision-making styles when grouped by educational attainment or length of service.

Table 19: Decision-Making Styles vs. Sex

Style	F-Value	p-value	Decision
Analytical	0.022	.881	Failed to Reject
Behavioral	0.094	.760	Failed to Reject
Conceptual	0.666	.416	Failed to Reject
Directive	0.048	.827	Failed to Reject

Table 20: Decision-Making Styles vs. Age

Style	F-Value	p-value	Decision
Analytical	2.73	.032	Rejected
Behavioral	2.50	.045	Rejected
Conceptual	1.76	.141	Failed to Reject
Directive	2.59	.039	Rejected

Table 21: Decision-Making Styles vs. Educational Attainment

Style	F-Value	p-value	Decision
Analytical	0.037	.964	Failed to Reject
Behavioral	0.394	.675	Failed to Reject
Conceptual	0.085	.918	Failed to Reject
Directive	0.323	.725	Failed to Reject

Table 22: Decision-Making Styles vs. Length of Service

Style	F-Value	p-value	Decision
Analytical	1.341	.258	Failed to Reject
Behavioral	1.318	.267	Failed to Reject
Conceptual	1.447	.222	Failed to Reject
Directive	0.499	.736	Failed to Reject

Significant at $p < 0.05$

Problem 8: Relationship Between Leadership Skills and Organizational Effectiveness

Table 23 presents the R-values and p-values for the relationship between leadership skills and organizational effectiveness indicators.

- In all categories and skill areas, the **null hypothesis is rejected**, indicating statistically **significant relationships**.
- The **strongest correlations** were found between **conceptual leadership skills** and:
  - **General administration** (R = .716, p = .000)
  - **Human resource development** (R = .702, p = .000)

Table 23: Relationship Between Leadership Skills and Organizational Effectiveness

Leadership Skill	General Admin (R/p)	HR Dev't (R/p)	Financial Mgmt (R/p)	Academic Prog. Mgmt (R/p)
Conceptual	.716** / .000	.702** / .000	.648** / .000	.667** / .000
Human	.682** / .000	.605** / .000	.656** / .000	.650** / .000
Technical	.639** / .000	.645** / .000	.662** / .000	.611** / .000

Significant at $p < 0.05$

Problem 9: Do Leadership Skills and Decision-Making Styles Influence Organizational Performance?

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis – Leadership and Decision-Making Styles as Predictors of Organizational Effectiveness

Table 24 presents the results of the multiple linear regression analysis identifying the leadership skills and decision-making styles that significantly predict organizational effectiveness.

- **Significant predictors** ($p < 0.05$) include:
  - **Conceptual leadership skill** ($\beta = .246$, $t = 2.95$, $p = .004$)
  - **Technical leadership skill** ($\beta = .198$, $t = 2.88$, $p = .005$)
  - **Analytical decision-making style** ($\beta = .316$, $t = 4.63$, $p = .000$)
- **Non-significant predictors** include:
  - **Human leadership skill** ($p = .897$)
  - **Behavioral, conceptual, and directive** decision-making styles ($p > .05$)

Model Fit Summary:

- Adjusted R^2 = **0.73**
- F-value = **50.761**, p = **.000**

Table 24: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Leadership Skills and Decision-Making Styles as Predictors of Organizational Effectiveness

Independent Variables	Beta	T-value	P-value	Interpretation
Leadership Skills				
Conceptual	.246	2.95	.004	Significant
Human	.010	0.130	.897	Not Significant
Technical	.198	2.88	.005	Significant
Decision-Making Styles				
Analytical	.316	4.63	.000	Significant
Behavioral	.011	0.162	.872	Not Significant
Conceptual	.130	1.70	.091	Not Significant
Directive	.034	0.641	.522	Not Significant
Constant				
	.257			
Adjusted R^2			**0.73**	
F-value			**50.761**	
Significance			**.000**	
Significant if P-value <0.05				

Item-Level Predictors from Conceptual, Technical, and Analytical Variables

Table 25 presents the best predictor items from conceptual and technical leadership skills and analytical decision-making style.

- **Significant items** under **conceptual leadership** include:
  - LC13 (Understands role of risk management) – B = .305, p = .000
  - LC15 (Identifies new opportunities) – B = .285, p = .000
  - LC11 (Thinks creatively) – B = .207, p = .002
  - LC14 (Updated in learning/teaching) – B = .200, p = .006
- **Significant items** under **technical leadership** include:
  - LT3 (Uses IT effectively) – B = .250, p = .000
  - LT1 (Delivers workplace change) – B = .200, p = .005
  - LT2 (Presides objectively) – B = .170, p = .005
  - LT5 (Consults staff network) – B = .152, p = .016
- **Significant items** under **analytical decision-making** include:
  - DA19 (Solicits perspectives) – B = .403, p = .000
  - DA16 (Gathers relevant info) – B = .198, p = .012
  - DA20 (Depth of info matters) – B = .171, p = .042

Table 25: Multiple Linear Regression – Final Predictor Items for Organizational Effectiveness

Code	Independent Variables	Beta	T-value	P-value	Interpretation
Conceptual Leadership Skills					
LC11	Thinks creatively	.207	3.168	.002	Significant
LC13	Understands role of risk management	.305	4.453	.000	Significant
LC14	Updated in current developments	.200	2.795	.006	Significant
LC15	Identifies new opportunities	.285	3.836	.000	Significant
Technical Leadership Skills					
LT1	Delivers workplace change	.200	2.879	.005	Significant
LT2	Presides objectively	.170	2.882	.005	Significant
LT3	Uses IT effectively	.250	3.979	.000	Significant
LT5	Consults staff network	.152	2.444	.016	Significant
Analytical Decision-Making Style					
DA16	Gathers relevant information	.198	2.536	.012	Significant
DA19	Solicits perspectives	.403	4.359	.000	Significant
DA20	Values depth of information	.171	2.050	.042	Significant

Problem 10: Structural-Functional Leadership Model for Academic Administrators

Model Fit Results Using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

Table 26 presents the fit indices for the proposed **Structural-Functional Leadership Model**. All indices indicate a **"Very Good Fit"** or **"Good Fit"**, validating the model's statistical strength.

- Chi-square/df (CMIN/DF): **1.921** – Very Good Fit
- Normed Fit Index (NFI): **0.923** – Very Good Fit
- Comparative Fit Index (CFI): **0.961** – Very Good Fit
- Incremental Fit Index (IFI): **0.961** – Very Good Fit
- RMSEA: **0.082** – Very Good Fit
- Goodness of Fit Index (GFI): **0.890** – Good Fit

Table 26: Model Fit Measures and Interpretation (Structural Equation Modeling)

Measure	Estimate	Threshold	Interpretation
Chi-square/df (CMIN/DF)	1.921	≤ 3.00	Very Good Fit
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	0.923	≥ 0.90	Very Good Fit
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.961	≥ 0.90	Very Good Fit
Incremental Fit Index (IFI)	0.961	≥ 0.90	Very Good Fit
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)	0.082	≤ 0.10	Very Good Fit
Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)	0.890	≥ 0.90	Good Fit

Model Type: Recursive Model

Discussion

This study explored the influence of leadership skills and decision-making styles on the organizational effectiveness of academic administrators in selected private higher educational institutions in Cagayan de Oro City. The key findings offer insights into how certain leadership attributes and decision-making behaviors enhance or hinder administrative performance in academic settings.

Interpretation of Results

The analysis revealed that **conceptual and technical leadership skills**, alongside the **analytical decision-making style**, significantly predicted organizational effectiveness. Among these, **conceptual leadership skills** had the strongest influence. This suggests that academic administrators who engage in strategic thinking, risk management, and the identification of new opportunities are more effective in leading their institutions. These findings support Katz's (1974) leadership framework, which emphasized conceptual skills as essential for upper-level managers who must engage in long-term planning and organizational vision.

The **technical leadership skill** dimension—especially the ability to use information technology and facilitate staff development—also played a secondary but meaningful role. This supports the views of Northouse (2016), who identified technical skills as fundamental for leaders to effectively execute specific functions, especially in environments with evolving technology demands like higher education.

Of the decision-making styles evaluated, **only the analytical style** had a significant impact on organizational effectiveness. This finding suggests that evidence-based, data-driven approaches to problem-solving—particularly those that involve gathering information from multiple sources and considering risks—are associated with better institutional outcomes. This aligns with Rowe and Boulgarides' (1992) assertion that analytical decision-makers are typically objective, thorough, and logical, making them effective in complex environments.

Notably, **human leadership skills** and the **behavioral, conceptual, and directive decision-making styles** did not show a statistically significant influence. While this may seem counterintuitive given traditional leadership theory, it indicates that in the specific context of academic administration, visionary and practical leadership combined with systematic decision-making are more critical than relational or routine-based approaches.

Comparison with Existing Literature

The study's findings corroborate the conceptual frameworks of Katz (1974) and Mumford et al. (2000), both of whom emphasized the importance of leadership skills adapted to organizational levels and roles. The prioritization of conceptual skills in this research echoes similar conclusions in educational leadership literature (Bush & Glover, 2014), where leaders are increasingly expected to innovate and steer institutional reforms.

The relevance of **analytical decision-making** is also supported by Simon (1977), who emphasized rational choice and evidence-based approaches in administrative effectiveness. The limited role of behavioral and directive styles might reflect a cultural or contextual reality in Philippine higher education institutions, where consultative and strategic leadership may be more valued than authoritative or routine-oriented approaches.

Implications of the Findings

The study has practical implications for leadership development in academic institutions. First, it suggests that recruitment, promotion, and training of academic leaders should focus on **developing conceptual and technical leadership skills**, with a strong emphasis on **analytical decision-making**. Institutions should consider integrating leadership assessments and behavioral interviews that probe these capabilities.

Moreover, **continuing education programs** aimed at current academic leaders should be oriented toward enhancing visionary thinking, risk management, technology use, and collaborative decision-making. Doing so will enable administrators to align their strategies with institutional goals and adapt to changing educational landscapes.

Theoretically, the study contributes to the growing body of knowledge that calls for **context-sensitive leadership models**. The proposed **Structural-Functional Leadership Model**, grounded in empirical evidence, provides a framework for identifying and enhancing leadership competencies that are most effective within the higher education sector in the Philippines.

Limitations

Despite its valuable contributions, this study has certain limitations. It relied on **self-reported assessments from faculty**, which may be subject to bias or personal perceptions. Future research could incorporate **multi-source feedback**, including evaluations from students, peers, and the administrators themselves.

Additionally, the study was conducted in a **limited geographic and institutional scope**—only selected private higher education institutions in Cagayan de Oro City. Therefore, while the findings may reflect local realities, they may not be fully generalizable to public universities or institutions in other regions.

Finally, the **cross-sectional nature** of the study limits causal inferences. A longitudinal design might better capture how leadership skills and decision-making styles influence organizational effectiveness over time.

References

1. Abrea, R. R. (n.d.). Managerial competencies of associate dean in higher learning institutions. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researchers*, *6*(6). http://www.ijcar.net
2. Abubakar, A., Hilman, H., & Kaliappen, N. (2018). New tools for measuring global academic performance. *SAGE Open*, *8*(3), 215824401879078. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018790787
3. Ali Shurbagi, A. M., & Zahari, I. B. (2014). The mediating effect of organizational commitment on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational culture. *International Journal of Business Administration*, *5*(6). https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v5n6p24
4. Albanese, J., Birnbaum, M., Cannon, C., Cappiello, J., Chapman, E., Paturas, J., & Smith, S. (2008). Fostering disaster resilient communities across the globe through the incorporation of safe and resilient hospitals for community-integrated disaster responses. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, *23*(5), 385–390. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1049023x00006105
5. Ayobola Igunnu, A. (2020). Leadership styles and job performance among administrative heads of secondary schools. *The Universal Academic Research Journal*, *2*(1), 38–45. https://doi.org/10.17220/tuara.2020.01.4
6. Azeska, A., Starc, J., & Kevereski, L. (2017). Styles of decision making and management and dimensions of personality of school principals. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, *5*(2), 47–56. https://doi.org/10.5937/ijcrsee1702047a
7. Balbuena, S. E., Perez, J. E. M., Irudayaselvam, S., & Balaccua, M. M. (2020). Application of leadership theories in analyzing the effects of leadership styles on productivity in Philippine higher education institutions. *Online Submission*, *8*(3), 53–62. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED606847
8. Barrett, P., Davies, F., Zhang, Y., & Barrett, L. (2016). The holistic impact of classroom spaces on learning in specific subjects. *Environment and Behavior*, *49*(4), 425–451. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916516648735
9. Bisschoff, T. (2012). Leadership skills in management education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *40*(3), 412–413. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143212438798
10. Carson, P. P., Carson, K. D., & Roe, C. W. (1993). Social power bases: A meta-analytic examination of interrelationships and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *23*(14), 1150–1169. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01026.x
11. Civera, A., Donina, D., Meoli, M., & Vismara, S. (2019). Fostering the creation of academic spinoffs: Does the international mobility of the academic leader matter? *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *16*(2), 439–465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-019-00559-8
12. Fernandez, A. A., & Shaw, G. P. (2020). Academic leadership in a time of crisis: The coronavirus and COVID-19. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *14*(1), 39–45. https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21684
13. Fox, T. L., & Spence, J. W. (2005). The effect of decision style on the use of a project management tool. *ACM SIGMIS Database: The DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems*, *36*(2), 28–42. https://doi.org/10.1145/1066149.1066153
14. Henriques, C., & Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. (2021). Efficiency of secondary schools in Portugal: A novel DEA hybrid approach. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, *74*, 100954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2020.100954
15. Ibay, S. B., & Pa-alisbo, M. A. (2020). An assessment of the managerial skills and professional development needs of private Catholic secondary school administrators in Bangkok, Thailand. *World Journal of Education*, *10*(1), 149. https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v10n1p149
16. Issah, M. (2020). Leadership behavior analysis: The case of three academic middle-level leaders in higher education. *Open Journal of Leadership*, *9*(3), 141–155. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojl.2020.93009
17. Kayode, B. (2014). Leadership and decision-making: A study on reflexive relationship between leadership style and decision-making approach. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, *4*(4), 473–484. https://doi.org/10.9734/bjesbs/2014/5514
18. Linton, J. D., Tierney, R., & Walsh, S. T. (2012). What are research expectations? A comparative study of different academic disciplines. *Serials Review*, *38*(4), 228–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2012.10765471
19. Macionis, J. J. (2002). *Sociology*. Recording for the Blind & Dyslexic.
20. Marete, J. B., Mugwe, M., Ochieng, P., & Reche, G. N. (2020). An assessment of school management decision-making practices and its influence on students' unrest management in public secondary schools in Meru County of Kenya. *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, *2*(3), 54–74. https://ajoeijournals.org/sys/index.php/ajoei/article/view/98
21. Martin, M. J., Aupperle, K. E., & Chen, R. (1996). Strategic leadership and skill usage by academic presidents. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *3*(1), 139–150. https://doi.org/10.1177/107179199600300113
22. Mello, A. L., & Delise, L. A. (2015). Cognitive diversity to team outcomes. *Small Group Research*, *46*(2), 204–226. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496415570916
23. Miller, B. A. (2016). *Assessing organizational performance in higher education*. John Wiley & Sons.

24. Moore, L. L., & Rudd, R. D. (2004). Leadership skills and competencies for extension directors and administrators. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *45*(3), 22–33. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2004.03022
25. Moore, L. L., & Rudd, R. D. (2005). Extension leaders' self-evaluation of leadership skill areas. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *46*(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2005.01068
26. Muftahu, M. (2020). Higher education and COVID-19 pandemic: Matters arising and the challenges of sustaining academic programs in developing African universities. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, *5*(4), 417–423. https://doi.org/10.24331/ijere.776470
27. Muhammad, K., Toryila, A. S., & Saanyol, D. B. (2020). The role of interpersonal relationship on job performance among employees of Gboko Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria. https://iiardpub.org/get/IJSSMR/VOL.%204%20NO.%205%202018/THE%20ROLE%20OF%20INTERPERSONAL.pdf
28. Mumford, M. D. (2009). *Leadership 101*. Springer Publishing Company.
29. Nygren, T. E., & White, R. J. (2002). Assessing individual differences in decision making styles: Analytical vs. intuitive. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, *46*(12), 953–957. https://doi.org/10.1177/154193120204601204
30. O'Neill, A. (2011). *Manager to leader: Skills and insights for a successful transition*. CCH Australia.
31. Okoli, J., & Watt, J. (2018). Crisis decision-making: The overlap between intuitive and analytical strategies. *Management Decision*, *56*(5), 1122–1134. https://doi.org/10.1108/md-04-2017-0333
32. Owen, J. (2011). *Leadership rules: 50 timeless lessons for leaders*. John Wiley & Sons.
33. Pitan, O. S., & Muller, C. (2019). University reputation and undergraduates' self-perceived employability: Mediating influence of experiential learning activities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *38*(6), 1269–1284. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1634678
34. Putney, L. G., & Broughton, S. H. (2011). Developing collective classroom efficacy: The teacher's role as community organizer. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(1), 93–105. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110381760
35. Sakowski, J. A., Hewitt, A. M., Johri, N., & Wagner, S. L. (2020). Implementing an incremental approach for developing leadership and professionalism skills among early careerists in the health administration curriculum. *The Journal of Health Administration Education*, *37*(1), 89. https://www.proquest.com/openview/a490402ad9ae39550c5e180f7ec89f00/1?cbl=105455&pq-origsite=gscholar