



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***EFFECTS OF COLLEGIAL MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP TRAINING
PROGRAMME ON ACADEMIC LEADERS' TRANSFER OF TRAINING IN
A PUBLIC UNIVERSITY IN MALAYSIA***

NURUL AFIQAH BINTI ZULKIFLY

FPP 2021 32



**EFFECTS OF COLLEGIAL MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP TRAINING
PROGRAMME ON ACADEMIC LEADERS' TRANSFER OF TRAINING IN
A PUBLIC UNIVERSITY IN MALAYSIA**

By

NURUL AFIQAH BINTI ZULKIFLY

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra
Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

May 2021

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in
fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**EFFECTS OF COLLEGIAL MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP TRAINING
PROGRAMME ON ACADEMIC LEADERS' TRANSFER OF TRAINING IN
A PUBLIC UNIVERSITY IN MALAYSIA**

By

NURUL AFIQAH BINTI ZULKIFLY

May 2021

Chair : Ismi Arif Ismail, PhD
Faculty : Educational Studies

Nowadays leading a 'republic of scholars' in universities through hierarchical lens, is deemed an irrelevant approach. Collegial management leadership (CML) has been hugely lacking among academic leaders in Malaysian universities, although it can improve the performance of faculties. The Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE), Malaysia through its Higher Education Leadership Academy (AKEPT) emphasised the need for university academic leaders to be well-equipped with CML competencies. Therefore, this study aimed to measure the effects of collegial management leadership training (CMLT) programmes on transfer of training through participants' perceived ability to practice the training conduct in their respective roles as leaders at a public university in Malaysia. This study integrated Baldwin and Ford's (1988) transfer process model and Bess' (1992) collegial model to measure the effects of the training interventions.

Sixty university academic leaders comprising of deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators who are working in a public university in Malaysia participated in this study and they were non-randomly assigned to Cohort 1 (n=30) and Cohort 2 (n=30). This study adopted quasi-experimental design (pre-test and post-test, one group design) to determine the difference in training design (perceived content validity and transfer design), CML and transfer of training, before and after the training programmes. The two cohorts received structured CMLT programmes, namely CMLT-A (for Cohort 1) and CMLT-B (for Cohort 2). Both training programmes were guided by AKEPT's

CML module, but differs in training design, whereby CMLT-A incorporated one participant-centred learning tool (case study), while CMLT-B incorporated three. Participants were then assessed using a self-assessment survey questionnaire. Participants were assessed two times; before (pre-test) and after (post-test) the CMLT programmes, respectively. The post-test was administered six weeks after the training programme took place.

The findings of this study suggested that most participants of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 rated an increased level of training design, CML and transfer of training after they attended the training programme. There were positive, significant differences found between the pre- and post-test scores of training design, CML and transfer of training among both cohorts without controlling for covariates. However, after controlling for covariates, perceived content validity was found to be positive, significantly different among participants of Cohort 1. Nonetheless, only training participants of Cohort 2 showed positive, significant differences between the pre- and post-test scores of CML and transfer of training.

In conclusion, CMLT-B programme affects transfer of training among the academic leaders. Behavioural level training evaluation is important to determine the effectiveness of a training programme. Furthermore, participant-centred learning tools, such as case study is crucial in designing an effective training programme. Through the amalgamation of transfer of training and collegial theories, this study theoretically confirmed and contributed to the HRD body of knowledge regarding the vitality of training design to best facilitate academic leaders' transfer of training. Practically, this study may assist HRD units and the academic leaders to identify a working training design that allows participants to transfer the training through the use of participant-centred learning tools, such as case study.

Abstrak yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Univeriti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**KESAN PROGRAM LATIHAN PENGURUSAN KEPEMIMPINAN
KESERAKANAN KE ATAS PEMINDAHAN LATIHAN DALAM
KALANGAN PEMIMPIN AKADEMIK UNIVERSITI AWAM DI
MALAYSIA**

Oleh

NURUL AFIQAH BINTI ZULKIFLY

Mei 2021

Pengerusi : Ismi Arif Ismail, PhD
Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan

Pada masa kini, memimpin 'republik cendekiawan' melalui lensa hierarki dianggap sebagai pendekatan yang tidak relevan. Kepemimpinan pengurusan keserakanan (CML) tidak dipraktikkan dalam kalangan pemimpin akademik universiti di Malaysia, walaupun ia dapat meningkatkan prestasi fakulti. Kementerian Pengajian Tinggi (MOHE), Malaysia melalui Akademi Kepimpinan Pengajian Tinggi (AKEPT) menekankan bahawa pemimpin akademik universiti mesti dilengkapi dengan kompetensi CML. Oleh itu, kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengukur kesan program latihan pengurusan kepemimpinan keserakanan (CMLT) tersebut melalui persepsi pemindahan latihan oleh peserta dalam tugas mereka selaku pemimpin akademik sebuah universiti awam di Malaysia. Kajian ini mengintegrasikan model proses pemindahan oleh Baldwin dan Ford (1988) dan model keserakanan oleh Bess (1992) dalam mengukur kesan intervensi latihan ini.

Enam puluh orang pemimpin akademik universiti yang terdiri daripada Dekan, Timbalan Dekan, Ketua Jabatan dan Penyelaras Subjek yang bekerja di sebuah universiti awam di Malaysia telah menyertai kajian ini dan mereka telah ditempatkan secara tidak rawak di dalam Kumpulan 1 ($n = 30$) dan Kumpulan 2 ($n = 30$). Kajian ini menggunakan reka bentuk kuasi-eksperimen (ujian pra dan pasca, satu kumpulan) untuk menentukan perbezaan reka bentuk latihan (tanggapan kesahan kandungan dan reka bentuk pemindahan), kepemimpinan pengurusan keserakanan dan pemindahan latihan, sebelum dan selepas program latihan. Kedua-dua kumpulan menerima program CMLT berstruktur

iaitu CMLT-A (bagi Kumpulan 1) dan CMLT-B (bagi Kumpulan 2). Kedua-dua program latihan tersebut adalah berpandukan modul kepemimpinan pengurusan keserakanan oleh AKEPT, namun berbeza dari segi reka bentuk latihan dimana CMLT-A menggunakan satu alat pembelajaran berpusatkan peserta (kajian kes), manakala CMLT-B pula menggunakan tiga alat pembelajaran berpusatkan peserta (kajian kes). Peserta kemudian dinilai menggunakan borang soal selidik tinjauan sendiri. Peserta dinilai sebanyak dua kali, sebelum (latihan pra) dan selepas (pasca ujian) program latihan. Ujian pasca dilakukan enam minggu selepas program latihan dijalankan.

Hasil kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa sebahagian besar peserta Kumpulan 1 dan Kumpulan 2 mengalami peningkatan tahap reka bentuk latihan, kepemimpinan pengurusan keserakanan dan pemindahan latihan setelah mereka mengikuti program latihan. Terdapat perbezaan yang positif dan signifikan antara skor pra dan pasca ujian reka bentuk latihan, CML dan pemindahan latihan di antara kedua-dua kohort tanpa mengawal pengaruh pembolehubah kovariasi. Walau bagaimanapun, setelah mengawal pengaruh pembolehubah kovariasi, tahap tanggapan kesahan kandungan didapati berbeza secara signifikan dalam kalangan peserta Kumpulan 1. Walaupun begitu, hanya peserta latihan Kumpulan 2 yang menunjukkan perbezaan yang signifikan antara skor pra dan pasca ujian CML dan pemindahan latihan.

Kesimpulannya, program CMLT-B mempengaruhi pemindahan latihan dalam kalangan pemimpin akademik. Penilaian latihan tahap tingkah laku sangat penting untuk menentukan keberkesanan sesuatu program latihan. Tambahan pula, alat pembelajaran berpusatkan peserta, seperti kajian kes didapati sangat penting dalam merancang program latihan yang efektif. Melalui penggabungan teori pemindahan latihan dan keserakanan, kajian ini secara teorinya mengesahkan dan menyumbang kepada badan pengetahuan HRD mengenai kepentingan reka bentuk latihan untuk memudahkan pemindahan latihan. Secara praktikal, kajian ini dapat membantu unit HRD serta pemimpin akademik di universiti untuk mengenal pasti reka bentuk latihan yang berkesan serta membolehkan peserta memindahkan latihan melalui penggunaan alat pembelajaran berpusatkan peserta, seperti kajian kes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillah...

First of all, I would like to thank Professor Dr. Ismi Arif Ismail, my supervisor, source of support and mentor not only academically but also interpersonally. Thank you very much for teaching me and putting up with me for the entire three years of my study. Thank you for having confidence in my ability to complete this research. Thank you for all the time you have spent coaching and responding to all my questions and concerns. Without your guidance, completing my study would be very tough.

Thank you very much to my supervisory committee members, Associate Professor Dr. Soaib Asimiran and Dr. Siti Noormi Alias who supported the completion of my study through motivation and continuous supervision. Many thanks for the time you spent revising my thesis.

Also, to my husband, Ahmad Shakir Roslan, thank you so much for being one of the sources of my strength, support and experiences throughout this meaningful journey. You have been very supportive and understanding towards my study. I could not have done this in time without you. Thank you for staying close and available.

Finally, I would like to extend my gratitude to my parents, Rozita Ujang and Zulkifly Mohd Nor and also to my sister, Nurul Anis Azwa, who have been going through thick and thin together with me in the completion of my study. You complement me in every aspect of my life.

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Ismi Arif bin Ismail, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairperson)

Soaib bin Asimiran, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Siti Noormi binti Alias, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

ZALILAH MOHD SHARIFF, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 12 August 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
 CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study	6
1.4 Hypotheses of the Study	7
1.5 Significance of the Study	8
1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study	8
1.7 Definition of Terms	10
1.8 Chapter Summary	12
 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	13
2.1 Human Resource Development and Academic Leadership	13
2.2 Collegial Management Leadership Training for University Academic Leaders	14
2.3 Instructional Systems Design (ISD) Process and Model	19
2.3.1 The ADDIE Model	20
2.3.2 Theorising Learning in the Application of ISD	23
2.4 Training Objectives and Implementation	24
2.4.1 Taxonomy of Training Objectives	25
2.4.2 Training Activities and Delivery	26
2.5 Training Evaluation	27
2.5.1 Types of Training Evaluation	28
2.5.2 Kirkpatrick's (1994) Evaluation Model	29
2.6 Transfer of Training	31
2.6.1 Factors Influencing Transfer of Training	32
2.6.2 Previous Studies Related to	33

	Training Design and Transfer of Training	
	2.6.3 Theorising Training Design	36
2.7	Theoretical Framework	38
2.8	Underpinning Theory	42
2.9	Research Framework	44
2.10	Chapter Summary	45
3	METHODOLOGY	46
3.1	Research Design	46
3.2	Population and Sampling	47
3.3	Study Instrument	48
	3.3.1 Transfer of Training	48
	3.3.2 Training Design	48
	3.3.3 Collegial Management Leadership	49
	3.3.4 Trainee Characteristics	49
	3.3.5 Work Environment	50
3.4	Pilot Study	50
3.5	Reliability	51
3.6	Validity	52
	3.6.1 Internal Validity	52
	3.6.2 External Validity	53
3.7	Ethical Consideration	54
	3.7.1 Protection of Human Participants	53
	3.7.2 Informed Consent	54
	3.7.3 Privacy and Confidentiality	55
3.8	Procedures	55
	3.8.1 Data Collection	55
	3.8.2 Quasi-experimental	58
3.9	Collegial Management Leadership Training Programmes	60
	3.9.1 Content Overview	60
	3.9.2 Learning Objectives	60
	3.9.3 Programme Objectives	61
	3.9.4 Programme Schedule	61
3.10	Data Analysis	63
	3.11.1 Data Screening	64
	3.11.2 Covariates	65
3.11	Chapter Summary	67
4	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	68
4.1	Participants' Profile	68
4.2	Objective 1: To determine the levels of pre- and post-scores of training design (perceived content validity and transfer design), collegial management leadership and transfer of training among participants of Cohort 1 and	70

	Cohort 2.	
4.3	Objective 2: To determine the significant difference between pre- and post-scores of training design (perceived content validity and transfer design), collegial management leadership and transfer of training of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2.	75
4.4	Objective 3: To determine the significant difference between pre- and post-scores of training design (perceived content validity and transfer design), collegial management leadership and transfer of training of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2, controlling for covariates.	78
4.5	Summary of Paired Sample t-test and MANCOVA Findings	84
4.6	The Overall Results of Hypotheses	85
4.7	Chapter Summary	86
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	87
5.1	Summary of Research	87
5.2	Conclusion	89
5.3	Implications of the Study	90
	5.3.1 Implications for Theory in HRD	90
	5.3.2 Implications for Practice in HRD	91
5.4	Recommendations	92
	5.4.1 Recommendations for Practice	92
	5.4.2 Recommendations for Future Studies	93
	REFERENCES	95
	APPENDICES	116
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	138
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Training Design Theories	37
3.1 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient	51
3.2 CMLT-A Programme Schedule	61
3.3 CMLT-B Programme Schedule	62
3.4 Summary of Statistical Tools Used in This Study	63
3.5 Skewness and Kurtosis of variables for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2	64
3.6 Results of Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2	65
4.1 Participant's Profile	66
4.2a Levels of Training Design, Collegial Management Leadership and Transfer of Training Cohort 1	71
4.2b Levels of Training Design, Collegial Management Leadership and Transfer of Training Cohort 2	73
4.3a Paired Sample t-test Cohort 1	75
4.3b Paired Sample t-test Cohort 2	77
4.4a Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) Cohort 1	79
4.4b Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) Cohort 2	80
4.5 Summary of paired sample t-test and MANCOVA Results	84
4.6 The Overall Results of Hypotheses	85

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 The ADDIE Model (Gagne et al., 2005, p. 21)	21
2.2 Kirkpatrick's (1994) Four-level Evaluation Model	29
2.3 Theoretical Framework	41
2.4 Baldwin and Ford (1988) Transfer Process Model	43
2.5 Research Framework	44
3.1 Data Collection Procedures	57
3.2 Quasi-experimental Procedures	59

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAUP	American Association of University Professors
ADDIE	Analyse, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate
AKEPT	Higher Education Leadership Academy
CML	Collegial Management Leadership
CMLT	Collegial Management Leadership Training
CMLT-A	Collegial Management Leadership Training A (training programme for Cohort 1 with one embedded case study)
CMLT-B	Collegial Management Leadership Training B (training programme for Cohort 2 with three embedded case studies)
HRD	Human Resource Development
ISD	Instructional Systems Design
KSA	Knowledge, Skill, Attitude
MOHE	Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia
MANCOVA	Multivariate analysis of covariance
ROI	Return on investment
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Leaders are significant individuals who represent formal and informal procedures, decisions and activities in organisations (Farh et al., 1990; Demirtas & Akdogan, 2015; Rydland & Stensaker, 2018). They either govern or manage other employees of the organisation, influence the attitudes and behaviours of peers and subordinates, and eventually determine the efficacy and accomplishment of the organisation. Yukl (2013) explained that as an organisation becomes larger and more complex, managing becomes more important, hence, leadership becomes more crucial. Such leaders are “key actors” in human resource development (HRD) (Lavigne, 2019). It is undeniable that leadership is important in all organisations, and universities are not excluded from this (Bieletzki, 2018). The transformation of a university must be driven by university leaders at all levels, namely the department, faculty, and the central university administration. However, a university’s academic leadership holds a unique concept as universities are academic-based institutions seeking to serve the wider world beyond just itself (Bieletzki, 2018).

Academic leadership roles in a university specifically include deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators (Branson, Franken & Penney, 2016). The roles of university academic leaders are complex as they are often challenged to balance administrative control and faculty autonomy, while consequently creating an open and welcoming atmosphere for the students (Williams, 2007). Practically, academic leaders are often defined with both management and supervisory responsibilities (Heng & Marsh, 2009), which “require leaders who thrive on challenge of change; who foster environments of innovation, who encourage trust and learning; and who lead themselves, their constituents, and their units, departments, and universities successfully into the future” (Brown, 2001, p. 312). However, according to Brown and Moshavi (2002), balancing those instances is not an easy task even for a highly educated, developed and experienced leader. Not to forget the rising paradigm of consumerism in universities, increased utilisation and adaptation of new technologies, as well as financing issues that thus demand a leader with knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) to walk the institution through uncertainty and change, while still preserving the unique sense of knowledge (Christopher, 2012).

Therefore, the hierarchical (top-down approach) leadership is argued to be outmoded and that collegial management leadership (CML) should come first because university academics have their own areas of expertise and experience (Bieletzki, 2018). Hence, in the academic arena, it is difficult to say that one is more superior than the other. Collegial management leadership fundamentally includes policy determination and formulation, decision-making based on a process of discussions, agreements and consensus, and sharing of power among some or all of the members of the institution (Bush, 2011, p. 72; Kwiek, 2015). The concept and elements of CML are in line with the elements of Islamic leadership practiced by Prophet Muhammad (saw) and his successors in the early, golden era of Islam, which centres around the elements of '*adl* (the principle of equality and justice), *shura* (consultative rule), *ijma'* (consensus), *haqq* (right) and *ijtihad* (independent reasoning) (Islam & Islam, 2020).

Countries across South East Asia, such as Vietnam, Taiwan, Indonesia and Thailand have also been trying to nurture CML among academic leaders and faculty members through leadership training and development programmes (Phuong, Duong & McLean, 2015; Phuong, Cole & Zarestkey, 2018). While the hierarchical or bureaucratic mode of leadership and governance is associated with great organisational effectiveness at the institutional level by some scholars, faculties in Taiwan expressed strong needs towards the collegial form of leadership as the former is claimed to often hinder the faculty's academic autonomy and equality (Huang & Marginson, 2017). Similarly, in western countries such as the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France, there has been a constant rise of CML in universities in an effort to distance the academic arena from the concept of industrialisation (Peters, 2020). Undoubtedly, the effort to nurture CML in universities around the globe primarily relies on training and development programmes (Daniëls, Muijters & Hondeghem, 2021).

In the context of Malaysia particularly, since universities are mostly under a substantial level of government control i.e., the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia, university governance involving the rules, regulations, policies and to a certain extent, its culture, mirrors that of a government agency (Christopher, 2012). Collegial management leadership and academic freedom in Malaysian universities were found to be essentially limited (Christopher, 2012) despite its importance (Macfarlane, 2016). According to Lee (2018), Malaysian universities are generally subjected to a bureaucratic and corporate working environment, taking away the uniqueness of being knowledge-based institutions. As such, Malaysian universities are subjected to more public accountability in place of institutional autonomy (Lee, 2018). This circumstance has, unfortunately, hindered CML to grow healthily among faculty members as the ecosystem has become highly competitive. Following this, the importance and appropriateness of CML in universities came to be recognised by the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia (MOHE, 2017), accentuating that university leaders must

be equipped with the capacities to demonstrate excellence in CML (MOHE, 2016; MOHE, 2017). As training and development evolved to become one of the key components to unleash human potentials, which is the main purpose of HRD, MOHE requires universities to conduct impactful CML training and development programmes for academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators. Following that, universities have increasingly been focused on offering leadership training to their academic leaders in order for the institution to achieve a significant improvement in performance (Taylor, 2018). Therefore, in the context of this study, there is a need to conduct collegial management leadership training (CMLT) programmes for academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators.

However, Deloitte (2014) revealed that organisations that invest considerably in leadership training and development anticipate effective outcomes. An effective training focuses on two critical outcomes, which are learning and transfer of training (Holton, Bates & Ruona, 2000). An unsuccessful training is not only poor return on investment, but also leads leaders to believe that they are implementing change through training and development programmes, thus delaying the realisation that they themselves must lead the change (Beer, Finnstorm & Schrader, 2016). Learning alone is not a sufficient measure or evidence to determine the effectiveness of a training programme as learning is bound within the confinement of cognitive aptitude, without looking further on participants' ability to practice the learned knowledge (Collins, 2002). Ultimately, an effective training programme must translate to positive and meaningful behavioural change in workplace as well. The remnant question however, is what measure can be used to evaluate behavioural change in order to ensure training effectiveness?

Scholars have argued that transfer of training, which is the learner's ability to practice what he/she learned, is the most appropriate measure to determine behavioural change resulting from the effects of a training programme (Burrow & Berardinelli, 2003; Renta-Davids, Jiménez-González, Fandos-Garrido, & González-Soto, 2014; Ng & Ahmad, 2018). Velada, Caetano, Michel, Lyons and Kavanagh (2007) emphasised that the cost spent on training is merely wasted with the absence of transfer of training. In other words, transfer of training is a crucial reflection of an effective training to avoid 'training robbery', which is hefty investment in training and development without expected return (Beer et al., 2016). Transfer of training is referred to as applying learned knowledge, skills and attitudes from training programmes to work settings (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Baldwin, Ford & Blume, 2009; Ng & Ahmad, 2018). Baldwin and Ford (1998) identified three key components of transfer of training, namely trainee characteristics, training design, and work environment, to which training design explains a hefty 65% of transfer of training (Kasim & Ali, 2011; Salahuddin, Mehar & Kazi, 2020).

Transfer of training is maximised when the overall training design, content and instructional strategies are related to the objective of transfer (Bhatti & Kaur, 2010). Training design generally refers to a systematic blueprint for training programme development in order to achieve the targeted training objectives (Lacerenza, Reyes, Marlow, Joseph & Salas, 2017). Scholars call for further investigation regarding the effects of training design on transfer of training as training design is the only determinant among three key determinants of transfer of training that can be manipulated and intervened by researchers (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Bhatti & Kaur, 2010; Bhatti, Ali, Isa & Battour, 2014; Yang, Lowell, Talafha & Harbor, 2020). Participants are likely to transfer training knowledge to the work setting when they perceive that the training context is similar to their job and that the training is designed in such a way that helps them transfer learning to the job. Thus, depending on the target participants, the training programme can be uniquely designed to suit the participants' needs. In the context of this study, training was designed to enable participants to relate CML to their academic leadership roles as deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators, thus encouraging them to later transfer learned knowledge to their jobs.

In relation to training design, scholars highly suggest that participant-centred learning tools, such as case studies, play a crucial role in a good training design that affects transfer of training (Nikandrou, Brinia & Bereri, 2009; Bhatti & Kaur, 2010; Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski, 2019). The use of case study as an instructional method during training sessions helps participants to better relate the training content to the work setting and therefore helps develop critical thinking, problem-solving, as well as higher-order thinking skills within themselves (Ertmer et al., 2019). Therefore, this study has embedded a case study instructional method in the CMLT programmes (CMLT-A and CMLT-B) that was provided to the participants. Formative evaluation was made during the first training (CMLT-A) and the researcher decided to add more case studies for the next training programme (CMLT-B) based on the feedback received from the training participants and the collaborators of the programme. Therefore, to further investigate and identify the most fitting training design that affects transfer of training, two CMLT programmes were provided – the first training was called CMLT-A (one case study) and the second training was called CMLT-B (three case studies). Following that, the participants were assigned and grouped into two treatment groups, identified as Cohort 1 (CMLT-A) and Cohort 2 (CMLT-B).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Lack of participation in a decision-making process, also known as CML, is common in universities (MOHE, 2016; MOHE, 2017; Lavigne, 2019; Iqbal,

Akhtar & Saleem, 2020). Prior research on leadership in universities (e.g., Croucher & Lacy, 2020; Eustachio et al., 2020; Mwesigwa, Tusiime & Ssekiziyivu, 2020) have mainly focused on investigating leadership practices and leadership styles with limited focus on the collegial management aspect of leadership, especially among university academic leaders i.e., deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators. Internationally, Levine, González-Fernández, Bodurtha, Skarupski and Fivush (2015) conducted a research about the implementation and evaluation of a leadership programme for women faculty members at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. However, the findings cannot be generalised for both men and women academic leaders as the research only focused on women academic leaders. Locally, CML among university academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators is certainly an undervalued theory and practice (MOHE, 2017) as there are very limited studies regarding CML conducted in Malaysia (Christopher, 2012; Lee 2018; Lavigne, 2019). Hence, Malaysia is lagging behind western countries despite CML being an arguably fit leadership approach for universities. Thus, the lack of CML practice in universities needs to be addressed, and this calls for a CML training design intervention to better nurture CML qualities among university academic leaders (MOHE, 2017).

Theoretically, many previous research attempted to study transfer of training theory in the context of job performance (e.g., Na-Nan & Sanamthong, 2019; Martin, Zerbini & Medina, 2019; Arasanmi, 2019), but not many previous studies have attempted to integrate CML theory in their transfer of training research (e.g., Levine et al., 2015; Ng & Ahmad, 2018; Lavigne, 2019; Yaghi & Bates, 2020). This is an important theoretical gap as the integration of the two theories, which are Baldwin and Ford's (1988) transfer process model and Bess' (1992) collegial model, enables investigations on the effects of the CMLT programmes (CMLT-A and CMLT-B) on transfer of training among university academic leaders. The integration of the two theories demonstrates that training and development as well as leadership theories are two interconnected grounds that complement one another.

Methodologically, referring to the Kirkpatrick's (1994) four-level evaluation model, training programmes are frequently evaluated only through trainee's feedback (reaction level) and does not consider other reflective methods of training evaluation such as transfer of training (behavioural level) (Mohanty, 2019; Gegenfurtner, Zitt & Ebner, 2020). Although scholars have emphasised the importance of transfer of training to measure training effectiveness (Noe, 2017; Rampun, Zainol & Tajuddin, 2020), limited studies have been conducted to evaluate the effects of training programmes using the transfer of training measure (Packard & Jones, 2015; Levine et al., 2015; Arabi, 2020). Nevertheless, many literatures reveal the influence of trainee characteristics, training design and work environment on transfer of training (e.g., Saks & Belcourt, 2006; Velada et al., 2007; Burke & Hutchins, 2008; Baldwin et al., 2009; Blume, Ford, Baldwin

& Huang, 2010; Renta-Davids et al., 2014; Nafukho, Alfred, Chakraborty & Johnson, 2017; Ng & Ahmad, 2018; Sahoo & Mishra, 2019) through correlational studies. However, to determine stronger findings, a causal relationship needs to be established through training design intervention (experimental research design) (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Gopalan, Rosinger & Ahn, 2020). Furthermore, training design explains 65% of transfer of training (Kasim & Ali, 2011; Salahuddin, Mehar & Kazi, 2020) and is considered to be the most likely element to be controlled (Chauhan, Ghosh, Rai and Kapoor, 2017; Meinel, Plattner, Leifer, 2021). Thus, training design intervention in the context of CML for university academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators is essentially unexplored.

Considering the crucial need to nurture and examine the prospect of the CML approach in university leadership and governance, training programmes that focus on CML needs to be implemented and evaluated for their effectiveness. Hence, this research aims to investigate the effects of the CMLT programmes (CMLT-A as a treatment for Cohort 1 and CMLT-B as a treatment for Cohort 2) on the transfer of training among academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators in one public research university in Malaysia.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This research aims to determine the effects of CMLT programmes (CMLT-A and CMLT-B) on transfer of training among academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators in a public university in Malaysia. The specific objectives are as follows:

1. To determine the levels of pre- and post-scores of training design (perceived content validity and transfer design), CML and transfer of training among participants of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2.
2. To determine the significant difference between pre- and post-scores of training design (perceived content validity and transfer design), CML and transfer of training of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2.
3. To determine the significant difference between pre- and post-scores of training design (perceived content validity and transfer design), CML and transfer of training of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2, controlling for covariates.

1.4 Hypotheses of the Study

To determine the effects of applying the CMLT programmes (CMLT-A and CMLT-B) on academic leaders' transfer of training in a public university in Malaysia, the hypotheses involved are as follows:

- H1_a:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of perceived content validity of Cohort 1.
- H1_b:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores perceived content validity of Cohort 2.
- H2_a:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of transfer design of Cohort 1.
- H2_b:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of transfer design of Cohort 2.
- H3_a:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of CML of Cohort 1.
- H3_b:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of CML of Cohort 2.
- H4_a:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of transfer of training of Cohort 1.
- H4_b:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of transfer of training of Cohort 2.
- H5_a:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of perceived content validity of Cohort 1, controlling for covariates.
- H5_b:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of perceived content validity of Cohort 2, controlling for covariates.
- H6_a:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of transfer design of Cohort 1, controlling for covariates.
- H6_b:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of transfer design of Cohort 2, controlling for covariates.
- H7_a:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of CML of Cohort 1, controlling for covariates.
- H7_b:** There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of CML of

Cohort 2, controlling for covariates.

H8a: There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of transfer of training of Cohort 1, controlling for covariates.

H8b: There is a positive difference between pre- and post-scores of transfer of training of Cohort 2, controlling for covariates.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The main focus of this study is transfer of training. Theoretically, this study expands the literature by addressing the methods in which training could be better designed to best facilitate university academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators to learn and later transfer CML knowledge to practice. Second, the integration of transfer of training and CML theories i.e., Baldwin and Ford's (1988) transfer process model and Bess' (1992) collegial model, contributes to the amalgamation of training and development, as well as leadership theories in HRD. This links together complementary notions of training and development as well as leadership in HRD rather than depict them to be exclusively independent. Third, CMLT programmes in this study were properly evaluated based on participants' behavioural change, which is the third level of the Kirkpatrick's (1994) evaluation model. The third level evaluation conducted in this study revealed more findings that leads to stronger contributions to HRD's body of knowledge. Fourth, this study controlled for covariates that affect transfer of training, which had established a cause-and-effect relationship between training design and transfer of training, hence robustly confirming theory.

Practically, this study serves as an insight to the university's HRD unit to better emphasise training design prior to implementing the training programmes using participants-centred learning tools such as case study. Second, this study further highlights the importance of analytically evaluating the effects of a training programme using the transfer of training measure. Third, this study sheds crucial insights on the appropriate leadership approach for university academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators, which is CML.

1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study primarily investigates the effects of CMLT programmes (CMLT-A and CMLT-B) on academic leaders' transfer of training in a public research university in Malaysia. This study defines CML training design that helps

academic leaders to better learn and ultimately transfer the training to their job. In this study, transfer of training revolves around CML actions or behaviours in particular, which is translated from the collegial KSA acquired by the academic leaders from the CMLT programmes implemented by the researchers. Academic leaders in this study involve deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators in a public research university. In executing the CMLT programmes, this study referred to the ADDIE instructional system design model. Behaviour change was evaluated via the transfer of training measure based on the Kirkpatrick's (1994) evaluation model.

This study, however, has certain limitations. First, behaviour change among CMLT programmes' participants was evaluated through the means of transfer of training rated by the participants themselves. This study did not involve ratings from the participants' peers or supervisors. Since the participants were the ones directly involved in the CMLT programmes, the respondents themselves are much closer to the subject matter i.e., CML, rather than other individuals. Therefore, the information they provided in the self-report questionnaire tends to be more accurate (Demetriou, Ozer & Essau, 2014).

Second, the CMLT programmes were designed mainly for university academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators. Therefore, the training design may or may not be suitable for academics without academic administrative positions and non-academic positions. Third, training evaluation involved in this study is up to the behaviour level of Kirkpatrick's (1994) evaluation model. There is the fourth and higher level in the evaluation model, which is the return level, but evaluating institutional return only on the basis of specific training programme(s) is highly complex due to the uncontrolled environment. Furthermore, transfer of training is sufficient to determine the benefit of CMLT programmes (Makransky, Borre-Gude & Mayer, 2019). Thus, this study focuses on the third level of the Kirkpatrick's (1994) evaluation model.

Fourth, this study involves university academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators who are working in a public research university in Malaysia as the research sample. Although data collection was from a single context, the CML module used for the CMLT programmes (CMLT-A and CMLT-B) was developed and used by the Higher Education Leadership Academy (AKEPT) of the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia (Ismail, Lin & Rahman, 2017), which is meant to be implemented by every public university in Malaysia. Therefore, as the module is federally used and accepted, the findings of this study can, to a certain extent, be generalised or relatable to other public research universities in Malaysia.

Fifth, the leadership background of this study is confined only within the context of CML among university academic deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators of the university involved. However, Mathews (2019) highlighted that within a single university, academics across different faculties culturize different practices of CML, known as the academic tribe. This means that dynamism and differences in CML exist within faculties across a single university. Hence, to engage in an in-depth study of CML, this study involved academics from faculties across one public research university in Malaysia.

1.7 Definition of Terms

The important terms used in this study are defined as follows:

Training

Conceptual Definition: Training refers to a systematic process which affects an individual's knowledge, skills and attitudes (KSA) that leads to an improved individual and organisational performance (Rabie, Cant & Wiid, 2016).

Operational Definition: Training in this study refers to a systematic and structured process that seeks to further develop an individual's knowledge, skills and attitudes to improve individual and university performance.

Training design

Conceptual Definition: Training design refers to a systematic blueprint for training programme development in order to achieve the targeted training objectives (Lacerenza et al., 2017).

Operational Definition: Training design in this study refers to a structured training programme that is systematically developed to achieve the training objectives.

Perceived content validity

Conceptual Definition: The extent to which trainees judge the training content to reflect job requirements accurately (Holton et al., 2000).

Operational Definition: The degree to which trainees perceive that the training content is relatable and closely matches his/her actual job.

Transfer design

Conceptual Definition: The extent to which (1) training design has been delivered to give trainees the ability to transfer learning to the job, and (2) training instructions matched job requirements (Holton et al., 2000).

Operational Definition: The degree to which training is designed to give the trainee the ability to transfer the learning to the job.

Training objectives

Conceptual Definition: Training objectives refer to the purpose and statements that define the expected goal of a training course in terms of demonstrable knowledge, skills or attitudes that are acquired by the trainee (Stacy & Freeman, 2016).

Operational Definition: Training objectives in this study refer to the intended measurable outcome that training participants will achieve once they have finished the training course.

Transfer of training

Conceptual Definition: Transfer of training refers to the application of acquired knowledge, skills and attitudes that trainees gain from a training programme to their work settings (Lacerenza et al., 2017).

Operational Definition: Transfer of training in this study refers to the extent to which a training participant is able to transfer what is learned during the training programme to their job.

Training evaluation

Conceptual Definition: Training evaluation refers to a systematic investigation to determine the achievement of a training programme (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016).

Operational Definition: Training evaluation in this study refers to the attempt to obtain relevant information and investigate the effects of a training programme.

Collegial management leadership (CML)

Conceptual definition: Collegial management leadership refers to the sharing of power and authority among colleagues (Bieletzki, 2018).

Operational definition: Collegial management leadership in this study refers to an academic leader's sharing of power and authority with colleagues and making collective decisions.

Academic leaders: Academic leaders in a university which include deans, deputy deans, heads of departments and subject coordinators (Branson et al., 2016).

Trainee characteristics: Trainee characteristics refer to the trainee's reactions and attitudes towards learning and transfer of KSA learned in training on the job (Holton et al., 2000).

Work environment: Work environment refers to work situation perceived by the trainee to either encourage or discourage their use of KSA learned in training on the job (Cromwell & Kolb, 2004).

Higher Education Leadership Academy (AKEPT): AKEPT is a government agency, which operates under the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia, that serves to train and develop university leaders with the required quality in order to bring impact to local higher learning institutions.

Cohort 1: Cohort 1 refers to the treatment group that participated in the CMLT-A programme, where one participant-centred learning tool (case study) was used as part of the training instructional methods.

Cohort 2: Cohort 2 refers to the treatment group that participated in the CMLT-B programme, where three participant-centred learning tools (case studies) were used as part of the training instructional methods.

1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter has discussed the background of this study, which involves transfer of training among university academic leaders. This chapter explained the statement of the problems that led to the investigation of this study, followed by the study objectives, the hypotheses involved, the significance of the study, the scope and limitations of the research, as well as the theoretical and operational definitions of the terms used in this study.

REFERENCES

- AAUP (American Association of University Professors) (2015). *Policy documents and reports*. JHU Press.
- Adesoji, F. A. (2018). Bloom taxonomy of educational objectives and the modification of cognitive levels. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(5), 292-297.
- Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations, and society. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 451-474.
- All, A., Plovie, B., Castellar, E. P. N., & Van Looy, J. (2017). Pre-test influences on the effectiveness of digital-game based learning: A case study of a fire safety game. *Computers & Education*, 114, 24-37.
- Alshaali, S., Hamid, K., Al-Ansi, A., & Safinaz, T. P. I. (2018). Transfer of training: Does training design preserve training memory. *Asian Social Science*, 14(10), 46-58.
- Alvarez, K., Salas, E., & Garofano, C. M. (2004). An integrated model of training evaluation and effectiveness. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(4), 385-416.
- Alvelos, R., Ferreira, A. I., & Bates, R. (2015). The mediating role of social support in the evaluation of training effectiveness. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 39(6), 484-503.
- Al-Mughairi, A. M. (2018). *The evaluation of training and development of employees: The case of a national oil and gas industry* (Doctoral dissertation). Brunel University.
- Alnajdi, S. M. (2018). The effectiveness of designing and using a practical interactive lesson based on ADDIE model to enhance students' learning performances in University of Tabuk. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(6), 212-221.
- American Educational Research Association. (2011). Code of conducts, *Educational Researcher*, 40(3), 145-156.
- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., Raths, J., Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Pearson, Allyn & Bacon.

- Antes, A. L., & Mumford, M. D. (2012). Strategies for leader cognition: Viewing the glass “half full” and “half empty”. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(3), 425-442.
- Arabi, E. (2020). *Training Design Enhancement Through Training Evaluation: Effects on Training Transfer* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Nevada.
- Arasanmi, C. N. (2019). Training effectiveness in an enterprise resource planning system environment. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 43(5), 476-489.
- Arievitch, I. M. (2020). The vision of developmental teaching and learning and bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 25, 1-6.
- Armstrong, P. (2016). *Bloom's taxonomy*. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/blooms-taxonomy>.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. (2018). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.
- Bacon, E. (2014). *Neo-collegiality: Restoring academic engagement in the managerial university*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Bălan, M., Marin, S., Mitan, A., Pinzaru, F., Vătămănescu, E. M., & Zbucnea, A. (2019). Leaders in focus: generational differences from a personality-centric perspective. *Management & Marketing*, 14(4), 372-385.
- Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 63-105.
- Baldwin, T. T., Ford, J. K., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Transfer of training 1988–2008: an updated review and agenda for future research. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 24(1), 41-70.
- Barrett, P., Gaskins, J., & Haug, J. (2019). Higher education under fire: Implementing and assessing a culture change for sustainment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 32(1), 164-180.
- Bärnighausen, T., Tugwell, P., Røttingen, J. A., Shemilt, I., Rockers, P., Geldsetzer, P., ... & Bor, J. (2017). Quasi-experimental study designs series – paper 4: Uses and value. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 89, 21-29.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and application*. Free Press.

- Beer, M., Finnstrom, M., & Schrader, D. (2016). The great training robbery. *Harvard Business School*, 16-121.
- Berry, T. (2008). Pre-test assessment. *American Journal of Business Education*, 1(1), 19-22.
- Bess, J. L. (1992). Collegiality: Toward a clarification of meaning and function. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, 8, 1-36.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education*. PHI Learning Private Ltd.
- Bhanji, F., Gottesman, R., de Grave, W., Steinert, Y., & Winer, L. R. (2012). The retrospective pre-post: a practical method to evaluate learning from an educational program. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 19(2), 189-194.
- Bhatti, A. M., & Kaur, S. (2010). The role of individual and training design factors on transfer of training. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34(7), 656-672.
- Bhatti, A. M., Ali, S., Isa, M. F., & Battour, M. M. (2014). Transfer of training and transfer motivation: The influence of individual, environmental, situational, training design, and affective reaction factors. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 27(1), 51-82.
- Bieletzki, N. (2018). *The power of collegiality*. Springer.
- Bier, B., Ouellet, É., & Belleville, S. (2018). Computerized attentional training and transfer with virtual reality: Effect of age and training type. *Neuropsychology*, 32(5), 597-614.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. Josey-Bass Publishers.
- Blanchard, P. N., & Thacker, J. W. (2007). *Effective training: Systems, strategies and policies*. Pearson Education.
- Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Huang, J. L. (2010). Transfer of training: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 1065-1105.
- Blume, B. D., Ford, J. K., Surface, E. A., & Olenick, J. (2019). A dynamic model of transfer of training. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(2), 270-283.
- Boulmetis, J., & Dutwin, P. (2014). *The ABCs of evaluation: Timeless techniques for program and project managers*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Branson, C. M., Franken, M., & Penney, D. (2016). Middle leadership in higher education: A relational analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 128-145.
- Broad, M. L., & Newstrom, J. W. (1992). *Transfer of Training: Action-packed strategies to ensure high payoff from training investments*. Corporate and Professional Publishing Group.
- Brown, L. M. (2001). Leading leadership development in universities: A personal story. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 10(4), 312-323.
- Brown, G., Irving, S., & Keegan, P. (2008). *An introduction to educational assessment, measurement, and evaluation: improving the quality of teacher-based assessment*. Pearson Education.
- Brown, F. W., & Moshavi, D. (2002). Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions to transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3), 79-93.
- Bujang, M. A., Sa'at, N., & Bakar, T. M. I. T. A. (2017). Determination of minimum sample size requirement for multiple linear regression and analysis of covariance based on experimental and non-experimental studies. *Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Public Health*, 14(3), 1-9.
- Burke, L. A., & Hutchins, H. M. (2008). A study of best practices in transfer of training and proposed model of transfer. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 19(2), 107-128.
- Burrow, J., & Berardinelli, P. (2003). Systematic performance improvement-refining the space between learning and results. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 15(1), 6-13.
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management*. Sage.
- Bush, T. (2013). Distributed leadership: The model of choice in the 21st century. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(5), 543-544.
- Bush, T. (2019). Distributed leadership and bureaucracy: Changing fashions in educational leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(1), 3-4.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (2015). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Ravenio Books.
- Capaldo, G., Depolo, M., Rippa, P., & Schiattone, D. (2017). Supervisor/peer involvement in evaluation transfer of training process and results reliability. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 29 (2), 134-148.

- Carbone, A., Drew, S., Ross, B., Ye, J., Phelan, L., Lindsay, K., & Cottman, C. (2019). A collegial quality development process for identifying and addressing barriers to improving teaching. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(7), 1356-1370.
- Chatterjee, D., & Corral, J. (2017). How to write well-defined learning objectives. *The Journal of Education in Perioperative Medicine: JEPM*, 19(4), 1-4.
- Chauhan, R., Ghosh, P., Rai, A., & Kapoor, S. (2017). Improving transfer of training with transfer design. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 29(4), 268-285.
- Chen, H. C., Holton, E. F., & Bates, R. A. (2006). Situational and demographic influences on transfer system characteristics in organizations. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 19(3), 7-25.
- Christopher, J. (2012). Governance paradigms of public universities: An international comparative study. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 18(4), 335-351.
- Collins, D. B. (2002). Performance-level evaluation methods used in management development studies from 1986 to 2000. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(1), 91-110.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: a meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 678-707.
- Connelly, L. M. (2008). Pilot studies. *Medsurg Nursing*, 17(6), 411-412.
- Cowman, M. C., & McCarthy, A. M. (2016). The impact of demographic and situational factors on transfer of training in a health care setting. *The Irish Journal of Management*, 35(2), 129-142.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Cromwell, S. E., & Kolb, J. A. (2004). An examination of work-environment support factors affecting transfer of supervisory skills training to the workplace. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(4), 449-471.
- Daniëls, E., Muyters, G., & Hondeghem, A. (2021). Leadership training and organizational learning climate: Measuring influences based on a field experiment in education. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 25(1), 43-59.

- Croucher, G., & Lacy, W. B. (2020). Perspectives of Australian higher education leadership: Convergent or divergent views and implications for the future? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 42(4), 516-529.
- Day, E. A., Blair, C., Daniels, S., Kligyte, V., & Mumford, M. D. (2006). Linking instructional objectives to the design of instructional environments: The integrative training design matrix. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(3), 376-395.
- Deloitte, B. (2014). *The corporate learning Factbook® 2014: Benchmarks, trends and analysis of the US training market*. Bersin & Associates.
- Demetriou, C., Ozer, B. U., & Essau, C. A. (2014). Self-report questionnaires. *The Encyclopedia of Clinical Psychology*, 1-6.
- Demirtas, O., & Akdogan, A. A. (2015). The effect of ethical leadership behavior on ethical climate, turnover intention, and affective commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(1), 59-67.
- Dessinger, J. C., & Moseley, J. L. (2015). *Confirmative evaluation: Practical strategies for valuing continuous improvement*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Diaz, K. (2013). *Hybrid learning: A study of training environment and transfer of training in Ecuador* (Doctoral dissertation). Capella University.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2013). A model for the systematic design of instruction. *Instructional Design: International Perspectives: Theory, Research, and Models*, 1, 361-370.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2005). The systematic design of instruction. *The University of Texas*, 1-19.
- Dill, D. D., Massy, W. F., Williams, P. R., & Cook, C. M. (1996). Accreditation & academic quality assurance: can we get there from here? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 28(5), 17-24.
- Dirani, K. M. (2012). Professional training as a strategy for staff development: A study in training transfer in the Lebanese context. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(2/3), 158-178.
- Dirani, K. M., Abadi, M., Alizadeh, A., Barhate, B., Garza, R. C., Gunasekara, N., ... & Majzun, Z. (2020). Leadership competencies and the essential role of human resource development in times of crisis: a response to Covid-19 pandemic. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(4), 380-394.

- Dong, H. (2021). Adapting during the pandemic: A case study of using the rapid prototyping instructional system design model to create online instructional content. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(3), 1-9.
- Donovan, P., Hannigan, K., & Crowe, D. (2001). The learning transfer system approach to estimating the benefits of training: empirical evidence. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25(2), 221-228.
- Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (2013). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 26(2), 43-71.
- Ertmer, P. A., Quinn, J. A., & Glazewski, K. D. (2019). *The ID casebook: Case studies in instructional design*. Routledge.
- Eustachio, J. H. P. P., Caldana, A. C. F., Will, M., Salvia, A. L., Rampasso, I. S., Anholon, R., ... & Kovaleva, M. (2020). Sustainability leadership in higher education institutions: An overview of challenges. *Sustainability*, 12(9), 1-19.
- Facteau, J. D., Dobbins, G. H., Russell, J. E., Ladd, R. T., & Kudisch, J. D. (1995). The influence of general perceptions of the training environment on pretraining motivation and perceived transfer of training. *Journal of Management*, 21(1), 1-25.
- Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16(4), 705-721.
- Fenyő, I. (2017). Professional development in higher education. *Practice and Theory in Systems of Education*, 12(3), 152-160.
- Fernandez, S., Cho, Y. J., & Perry, J. L. (2010). Exploring the link between integrated leadership and public sector performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 308-323.
- Finn, S. (2020). Academic freedom and the choice of teaching methods. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 25(1), 116-123.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. Pearson Education.
- Frisque, D. A., & Kolb, J. A. (2008). The effects of an ethics training program on attitude, knowledge, and transfer of training of office professionals: a treatment-and control-group design. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 19(1), 35-53.
- Gagne, R. M., & Briggs, L. J. (1974). *Principles of instructional design*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

- Gagne, R. M., Wager, W. W., Golas, K. C., Keller, J. M., & Russell, J. D. (2005). Principles of instructional design. *Performance Improvement*, 44(2), 44-46.
- Gegenfurtner, A., Zitt, A., & Ebner, C. (2020). Evaluating webinar-based training: a mixed methods study of trainee reactions toward digital web conferencing. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 24(1), 5-21.
- Geldhof, G. J., Warner, D. A., Finders, J. K., Thogmartin, A. A., Clark, A., & Longway, K. A. (2018). Revisiting the utility of retrospective pre-post designs: the need for mixed-method pilot data. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 70, 83-89.
- Ghasemy, M., & Hussin, S. (2014). Theories of educational management and leadership: A review of theories of educational management and leadership, *Universiti Malaya*, 1-10.
- Giberson, T. R., Tracey, M. W., & Harris, M. T. (2006). Confirmative evaluation of training outcomes. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 19(4), 43-61.
- Ginns, P., Kitay, J., & Prosser, M. (2010). Transfer of academic staff learning in a research-intensive university. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(3), 235-246.
- Gist, M. E., Bavetta, A. G., & Stevens, C. K. (1990). Transfer training method: Its influence on skill generalization, skill repetition, and performance level. *Personnel Psychology*, 43(3), 501-523.
- Goldberg, M. (2003). Trainers' task: Do more with less. *Pharmaceutical Executive*, 23(10), 110-114.
- Goldstein, I. L., & Ford, J. K. (2002). *Training in organizations: needs assessment, development, and evaluation*. Wadsworth.
- Gopalan, M., Rosinger, K., & Ahn, J. B. (2020). Use of quasi-experimental research designs in education research: Growth, promise, and challenges. *Review of Research in Education*, 44(1), 218-243.
- Gronn, P. (2010). Leadership: Its genealogy, configuration and trajectory. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 42(4), 405-435.
- Handley, M. A., Lyles, C. R., McCulloch, C., & Cattamanchi, A. (2018). Selecting and improving quasi-experimental designs in effectiveness and implementation research. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 39, 5-25.
- Harris, A. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: leading or misleading? *Management in Education*, 16(5), 10-13.

- Heng, M. A., & Marsh, C. J. (2009). Understanding middle leaders: A closer look at middle leadership in primary schools in Singapore. *Educational Studies*, 35(5), 525-536.
- Hill, R. (1998). What sample size is "enough" in internet survey research. *Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An Electronic Journal for the 21st Century*, 6(3-4), 1-12.
- Holton, E. F. III (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7 (1), 5-25.
- Holton III, E. F. (2005). Holton's evaluation model: New evidence and construct elaborations. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(1), 37-54.
- Holton III, E. F., & Baldwin, T. T. (2003). *Improving learning transfer in organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Holton III, E., Bates, R. A., Ruona, W. E., & Leimbach, M. (1998). Development and validation of a generalized learning transfer climate questionnaire: Final report. In R. Torraco (Eds.), *AHRD 1998 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 482-489). Academic of Human Resource Development.
- Holton III, E. F., Bates, R. A., & Ruona, W. E. (2000). Development of a generalized learning transfer system inventory. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(4), 333-360.
- Hoyle, E., & Wallace, M. (2005). *Educational leadership: Ambiguity, professionals and managerialism*. Sage.
- Howze, P. C. (2003). Collegiality, collegial management, and academic libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 29(1), 40-43.
- Huang, F., & Marginson, S. (2017). Higher education research in the Asia-Pacific. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 63, 1-6.
- Huang, R., Spector, J. M., & Yang, J. (2019). *Educational technology*. Springer.
- Ibrahim, A. A. (2015). Comparative analysis between system approach, Kemp, and ASSURE instructional design models. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(12), 261-270.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation: A collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in the planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral sciences*. Edits publishers.
- Islam, M. N., & Islam, M. S. (2020). *Islam and democracy in South Asia*. Palgrave.

- Ismail, N. A., Lin, A., & Rahman, S. A. (2017). *Academic leadership module: Collegial management*. Akademi Kepimpinan Pendidikan Tinggi (AKEPT).
- Iqbal, H. S., Akhtar, M. M. S., & Saleem, M. (2020). A Study of decision making styles of academic managers in public sector universities of the punjab. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 42(2), 181.
- Johnson, T. R. (2016). Violation of the homogeneity of regression slopes assumption in ANCOVA for two-group pre-post designs: Tutorial on a modified Johnson-Neyman procedure. *The Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 12(3), 253-263.
- Johnson, A. L., DuVivier, R. S., & Hambricht, W. G. (2017). Shared university governance: Faculty perceptions on involvement and leadership. *Leadership and Research in Education*, 4(1), 10-26.
- Johnson, S. K., Garrison, L. L., Hernez-Broome, G., Fleenor, J. W., & Steed, J. L. (2012). Go for the goal(s): Relationship between goal setting and transfer of training following leadership development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(4), 555-569.
- Julious, S. A. (2005). Sample size of 12 per group rule of thumb for a pilot study. *Pharmaceutical Statistics: The Journal of Applied Statistics in the Pharmaceutical Industry*, 4(4), 287-291.
- Kareem, M. A. (2019). The impact of human resource development on organizational effectiveness: An empirical study. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 7(1), 29-50.
- Kasim, R. S. R., & Ali, S. (2011). The influence of training design on transfer of training performance among support staff of higher education institution in Malaysia. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 2(5), 377.
- Kelly, J. (2017). Professional learning and adult learning theory: A connection. *Northwest Journal of Teacher Education*, 12(2), 1-16.
- Kemp, C., Tenenbaum, J. B., Griffiths, T. L., Yamada, T., & Ueda, N. (2006). Learning systems of concepts with an infinite relational model. *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence*, 3, 383-388.
- Kennedy, D., Hyland, A., & Ryan, N. (2006). *Writing and using learning outcomes: A practical guide*. <http://www.procesbolonski.uw.edu.pl/dane/learning-outcomes.pdf>

- King, H. (2004). Continuing professional development in higher education: what do academics do? *Planet*, 13(1), 26-29.
- Kirkpatrick, D. (1994). Great ideas revisited: techniques for evaluating training programs: Revisiting Kirkpatrick's four-level model. *Training and Development*, 50(1), 54-59.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (2009). *Implementing the four levels: A practical guide for effective evaluation of training programs*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Kirkpatrick D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. Berrett-Koehler.
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2016). *Kirkpatrick's four levels of training evaluation*. Association for Talent Development.
- Kim, J. H., & Lee, C. (2001). Implications of near and far transfer of training on structured on-the-job training. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 3(4), 442-451.
- Kligyte, G., & Barrie, S. (2014). Collegiality: Leading us into fantasy—the paradoxical resilience of collegiality in academic leadership. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(1), 157-169.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2012). *The adult learner*. Routledge.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212-218.
- Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook II: Affective domain*. David McKay.
- Kuchinke, K. P. (1995). Managing learning for performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(3), 307-316.
- Kwiek, M. (2015). The unfading power of collegiality? University governance in Poland in a European comparative and quantitative perspective. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 43, 77-89.
- Lacerenza, C. N., Reyes, D. L., Marlow, S. L., Joseph, D. L., & Salas, E. (2017). Leadership training design, delivery, and implementation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(12), 1-33.
- Ladyshewsky, R. K., & Flavell, H. (2012). Transfer of training in an academic leadership development program for program coordinators. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(1), 127-147.

- Lavigne, E. (2019). The collegial and managerial roles and qualifications of Canadian university deans. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(12), 2304-2317.
- Leberman, S., McDonald, L., & Doyle, S. (2006). *The transfer of learning: Participants' perspectives of adult education and training*. Gower.
- Lee, M. N. (2004). Global trends, national policies and institutional responses: Restructuring higher education in Malaysia. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 3(1), 31-46.
- Lee, M. N. (2018). *Higher Education Governance in East Asia*. Springer.
- Li, L., McLouth, C. J., & Delaney, H. D. (2019). Analysis of covariance in randomized experiments with heterogeneity of regression and a random covariate: The variance of the estimated treatment effect at selected covariate values. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1-15.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Levine, R. B., González-Fernández, M., Bodurtha, J., Skarupski, K. A., & Fivush, B. (2015). Implementation and evaluation of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine leadership program for women faculty. *Journal of Women's Health*, 24(5), 360-366.
- Macfarlane, B. (2016). Collegiality and performativity in a competitive academic culture. *Higher Education Review*, 48(2).
- Mager, R. F. (1997). *Preparing instructional objectives: A critical tool in the development of effective instruction*. The Center for Effective Performance.
- Makransky, G., Borre-Gude, S., & Mayer, R. E. (2019). Motivational and cognitive benefits of training in immersive virtual reality based on multiple assessments. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 35(6), 691-707.
- Martins, L. B., Zerbini, T., & Medina, F. J. (2019). Impact of online training on behavioral transfer and job performance in a large organization. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(1), 27-37.
- Mathews, K. (2018). Growing our own: Cultivating faculty leadership. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 50(3-4), 88-92.
- McArdle, G. E. (2015). *Training design and delivery: A guide for every trainer, training manager, and occasional trainer*. Association for Talent Development.

- McCauley, C. D., & Van Velsor, E. (2004). *The center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development*. John Wiley & Sons.
- McCauley, C. D. (2008). Leader development: A review of research. *Center for Creative Leadership*.
- Meiloud, O. A. (2017). The Islamic rational state: The arab islamists' new politico-legal discourses of a post-caliphate order (Doctoral dissertation). University of Arizona.
- Meinel, C., Plattner, H., & Leifer L. J. (2021). *Design thinking research: Interrogating the doing*. Springer Nature.
- Miller, M. T., Smith, E. A., & Nadler, D. P. (2016). Debate and discourse: The role of the faculty senate on the modern American campus. *Journal of Higher Education Theory & Practice*, 16(3), 22-29.
- Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia (MOHE). (2016). *Strengthening academic career pathways and leadership development*. Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia.
- Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia (MOHE), (2017). *Programme Book 2017*. Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia.
- Mitsakis, F. V. (2020). Human resource development (HRD) resilience: A new 'success element' of organizational resilience? *Human Resource Development International*, 23(3), 321-328.
- Mohanty, P. C., Dash, M., Dash, M., & Das, S. (2019). A study on factors influencing training effectiveness. *Revista Espacios*, (40), 7-15.
- Mohiuddin, M. G. (2016). Decision making style in Islam: A study of superiority of shura (participative management) and examples from early era of islam. *Decision Making*, 8(4), 79-88.
- Mohnot, H., & Shaw, T. (2017). The study of academic leadership preparedness and leadership style in higher education. *International Journal of Education and Management Studies*, 7(3), 408-416.
- Molenda, M., & Russell, J. D. (2006). Instruction as an intervention. *Handbook of Human Performance Technology*, 3, 335-369.
- Moore, S., Ellsworth, J. B., & Kaufman, R. (2008). Objectives – Are they useful? A quick assessment. *Performance Improvement*, 47(7), 41-47.

- Morgeson, F. P., DeRue, D. S., & Karam, E. P. (2010). Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 5-39.
- Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. J., Morrison, J. R., & Kalman, H. K. (2019). *Designing effective instruction*. Wiley.
- Mwesigwa, R., Tusiime, I., & Ssekiziyivu, B. (2020). Leadership styles, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among academic staff in public universities. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(2), 253-268.
- Nafukho, F. M., Alfred, M., Chakraborty, M., Johnson, M., & Cherrstrom, C. A. (2017). Predicting workplace transfer of learning: A study of adult learners enrolled in a continuing professional education training program. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 41(4), 327-353.
- Na-Nan, K., & Sanamthong, E. (2019). Self-efficacy and employee job performance. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 37(1), 1-17.
- Ng, K. H., & Ahmad, R. (2018). Personality traits, social support, and transfer of training: The mediating mechanism of motivation to improve work through learning. *Personnel Review*, 47(1), 39-59.
- Nikandrou, I., Brinia, V., & Bereri, E. (2009). Trainee perceptions of transfer of training: An empirical analysis. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(3), 255-270.
- Noe, R. A. (2017). *Employee training and development*. McGraw-Hill.
- Noor, I. (2015). *Altruistic service leadership: Prophet Muhammad's model*. Partridge Publishing Singapore.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. McGraw Hill.
- Ota, C., DiCarlo, C. F., Burts, D. C., Laird, R., & Gioe, C. (2006). Training and the needs of adult learners. *Journal of Extension*, 1-17.
- Packard, T., & Jones, L. (2015). An outcomes evaluation of a leadership development initiative. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(2), 153-168.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. Maidenhead.
- Para-González, L., Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Martínez-Lorente, A. R. (2018). Exploring the mediating effects between transformational leadership and organizational performance. *Employee Relations*, 40(2), 412-432.

- Peters, M. A. (2020). *Knowledge socialism: The rise of peer production: Collegiality, collaboration, and collective intelligence*. Springer Nature.
- Petriglieri, G., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2020). The return of the oppressed: A systems psychodynamic approach to organization studies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 411-449.
- Phillips, J. J. (1996). ROI: The search for best practices. *Training & Development*, 50(2), 42-48.
- Phillips, P. P., & Phillips, J. J. (2019). *ROI basics*. American Society for Training and Development.
- Phuong, T. T., Cole, S. C., & Zarestky, J. (2018). A systematic literature review of faculty development for teacher educators. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(2), 373-389.
- Phuong, T. T., Duong, H. B., & McLean, G. N. (2015). Faculty development in Southeast Asian higher education: A review of literature. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 16(1), 107-117.
- Rabie, C., Cant, M. C., & Wiid, J. A. (2016). Training and development in SMEs: South Africa's key to survival and success? *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 32(4), 1009-1024.
- Ramirez, T. V. (2017). On pedagogy of personality assessment: Application of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 99(2), 146-152.
- Rampun, R., Zainol, Z., & Tajuddin, D. (2020). The effects of training transfer on training program evaluation and effectiveness of training program. *Management Research Journal*, 9, 43-53.
- Randall, K. R., Resick, C. J., & DeChurch, L. A. (2011). Building team adaptive capacity: The roles of sensegiving and team composition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3), 525-540.
- Razai, M. S. (2019). The great training robbery. *British Journal of General Practice*, 69(679), 77-77.
- Reio, T. G., Rocco, T. S., Smith, D. H., & Chang, E. (2017). A critique of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 29(2), 35-53.
- Renta-Davids, A. I., Jiménez-González, J. M., Fandos-Garrido, M., & González-Soto, Á. P. (2014). Transfer of learning: Motivation, training design and

- learning-conducive work effects. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 38(8), 728-744.
- Roberto, F., Rey, A., Maglio, R., & Agliata, F. (2020). The academic “glass-ceiling”: investigating the increase of female academicians in Italy. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 28 (5), 1031-1054.
- Roha, I., Jais, M., Yahaya, N., & Ghani, E. K. (2020). Higher education leadership competency framework in malaysia: A refinement. *Humanities*, 8(4), 438-449.
- Romiszowski, A. J. (2016). *Designing instructional systems: Decision making in course planning and curriculum design*. Routledge.
- Rothwell, W. J. (2020). *Adult learning basics*. American Society for Training and Development.
- Rydland, M., & Stensaker, I. G. (2018). Mission Possible? How divisional leaders reassemble change initiatives to develop change capacity. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (pp. 14229-14260). Academy of Management.
- Sáez-López, J. M., Cózar-Gutiérrez, R., González-Calero, J. A., & Gómez Carrasco, C. J. (2020). Augmented reality in higher education: An evaluation program in initial teacher training. *Education Sciences*, 10(2), 26.
- Saha, M. (2021). “I will be aware of the appraisal, which will automatically change my work behaviour”: Evaluating training transfer. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 1-17.
- Sahlin, K., & Eriksson-Zetterquist, U. (2016). Collegiality in modern universities—the composition of governance ideals and practices. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 2016(2-3), 1-10.
- Sahoo, M., & Mishra, S. (2017). Training evaluation and motivation to transfer training-A review of literature. *Parikalpana: KIIT Journal of Management*, 13(2), 17-28.
- Sahoo, M., & Mishra, S. (2019). Effects of trainee characteristics, training attitudes and training need analysis on motivation to transfer training. *Management Research Review*, 49(2), 215-238.
- Saks, A. M., & Belcourt, M. (2006). An investigation of training activities and transfer of training in organizations. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 45(4), 629-648.

- Saks, A. M., & Burke, L. A. (2012). An investigation into the relationship between training evaluation and the transfer of training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 16(2), 118-127.
- Sala, G., Aksayli, N. D., Tatlidil, K. S., Tatsumi, T., Gondo, Y., Gobet, F., ... & Verkoeijen, P. (2019). Near and far transfer in cognitive training: A second-order meta-analysis. *Collabra: Psychology*, 5(1), 1-22.
- Salahuddin, S., Mehar, Q., & Kazi, H. (2020). Factors influencing transfer of training: Empirical evidence from public sector schools Hyderabad Pakistan. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 13(18), 1796-1802.
- Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2017). Design training systematically. In E. A. Locke (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of principles of organizational behavior* (pp. 43-59). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Schimmel, T., Johnston, P. C., & Stasio, M. (2013). Can "collegiality" be measured?: Further validation of a faculty assessment model of discretionary behaviors. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 21, 1-7.
- Seels, B. B., & Richey, R. C. (1994). *Instructional technology: The definition and domains of the field*. Association for Educational Communications and Technology.
- Seidle, B., Fernandez, S., & Perry, J. L. (2016). Do leadership training and development make a difference in the public sector? A panel study. *Public Administration Review*, 76(4), 603-613.
- Shah, S. (2018). 'We are equals'; datum or delusion: Perceptions of Muslim women academics in three Malaysian universities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 39(3), 299-315.
- Shams, S. R., & Hasan, R. (2020). Capacity building for transnationalisation of higher education. *European Business Review*, 32(3), 459-484.
- Sharp, P. R. (2018). *The creation of the local authority sector of higher education*. Routledge.
- Shivaraju, P. T., Manu, G., Vinaya, M., & Savkar, M. K. (2017). Evaluating the effectiveness of pre-and post-test model of learning in a medical school. *National Journal of Physiology, Pharmacy and Pharmacology*, 7(9), 947-951.
- Siebert, E. D., Caprio, M. W., & Lyda, C. M. (1997). *Methods of effective teaching and course management for university and college science teachers*. Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.

- Seigel, M. L., & Miner-Rubino, K. (2009). Measuring the value of collegiality among law professors. *Faulkner L. Rev.*, 1, 257-287.
- Silberman, M. L., & Biech, E. (2015). *Active training: A handbook of techniques, designs, case examples and tips*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Simpson E.J. (1972). *The classification of educational objectives in the psychomotor domain*. Gryphon House.
- Singh, P. (2014). Intervention of transformational collegial leadership to develop human resources. *The International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 13(1), 53-68.
- Singh, P., Manser, P., & Mestry, R. (2007). Importance of emotional intelligence in conceptualizing collegial leadership in education. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), 541-563.
- Smaldino, S. E., Lowther, D. L., Russell, J. D., & Mims, C. (2008). *Instructional technology and media for learning*. Pearson.
- Sofo, F. (2007). Transfer of training: A case-study of outsourced training for staff from Bhutan. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 11(2), 103-120.
- Srivastava, V., & Walia, A. M. (2018). An analysis of various training evaluation models. *International Journal of Advance and Innovative Research*, 5(4), 276-282.
- Stacy, W., & Freeman, J. (2016). Training objective packages: enhancing the effectiveness of experiential training. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, 17(2), 149-168.
- Steele, L. M., Mulhearn, T. J., Medeiros, K. E., Watts, L. L., Connelly, S., & Mumford, M. D. (2016). How do we know what works? A review and critique of current practices in ethics training evaluation. *Accountability in Research*, 23(6), 319-350.
- Stuns, K. K., & Heaslip, G. (2019). Effectiveness of humanitarian logistics training. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*, 9(2), 196-220.
- Sugar, W. (2014). Development and formative evaluation of multimedia case studies for instructional design and technology students. *TechTrends*, 58(5), 36-52.
- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

- Tapper, T., & Palfreyman, D. (2010). *The collegial tradition in the age of mass higher education*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Taylor, T. M. (2018). *Exploring factors that influence employee motivation to transfer training from a leadership development program: A qualitative case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Drexel University.
- Tiruneh, D. T., Cock, D. M., Gu, X., & Elen, J. (2018). Systematic design of domain-specific instruction on near and far transfer of critical thinking skills. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 87, 1-11.
- Treece, E. W., & Treece Jr, J. W. (1982). Elements of research in nursing. *Nursing Research*, 26(3), 239-250.
- Trust, T., & Pektas, E. (2018). Using the ADDIE model and universal design for learning principles to develop an open online course for teacher professional development. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 34(4), 219-233.
- Tyerman, J., Luctkar-Flude, M., Graham, L., Coffey, S., & Olsen-Lynch, E. (2019). A systematic review of health care presimulation preparation and briefing effectiveness. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 27, 12-25.
- Tziner, A., Haccoun, R. R., & Kadish, A. (1991). Personal and situational characteristics influencing the effectiveness of transfer of training improvement strategies. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64(2), 167-177.
- Uzunboylu, H., & Kosucu, E. (2020). An evaluation on instructional systems design. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 12(1), 30-41.
- Van Belle, G. (2011). *Statistical Rules of Thumb*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Van Gramberg, B., & Baharim, S. B. (2005). The influence of knowledge sharing on transfer of training: A proposed research strategy.
- Van Slyke, D. M., & Alexander, R. W. (2006). Public service leadership: Opportunities for clarity and coherence. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(4), 362-374.
- Van Tiem, D., Moseley, J. L., & Dessinger, J. C. (2012). *Fundamentals of performance improvement: Optimizing results through people, process, and organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Velada, R., Caetano, A., Michel, J. W., Lyons, B. D., & Kavanagh, M. J. (2007). The effects of training design, individual characteristics and work environment on transfer of training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 11(4), 282-294.

- Walter, C. S., Hengge, C. R., Lindauer, B. E., & Schaefer, S. Y. (2019). Declines in motor transfer following upper extremity task-specific training in older adults. *Experimental Gerontology*, 116, 14-19.
- Wart, M. V. (2003). Public-Sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 214-228.
- Watts, L. L., Medeiros, K., McIntosh, T., & Mulhearn, T. (2020). *Ethics training for managers: Best practice and techniques*. Routledge.
- Wehrmann, K. C., Shin, H., & Poertner, J. (2018). Transfer of training: An evaluation study. In *Evaluation research in child welfare: Improving outcomes through university-public agency partnerships* (pp. 23-37). Routledge.
- Wei Tian, A., Cordery, J., & Gamble, J. (2016). Returning the favor: Positive employee responses to supervisor and peer support for transfer of training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 20(1), 1-16.
- Werner, J. M. (2021). *Human resource development: Talent development*. Cengage Learning.
- Werner, J. M., & DeSimone, R. L. (2011). *Human resource development*. Cengage Learning.
- White, M. G. (2020). Why human subjects research protection is important. *Ochsner Journal*, 20(1), 16-33.
- Williams, J. R. (2007). *conceptualization of leadership and leadership development by academic department heads in colleges of agriculture at land grant institutions: A qualitative study* (Doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University.
- Wilson, J. P. (2005). *Human resource development: learning & training for individuals & organizations*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Wright, H. R., Cooper, L., & Luff, P. (2017). Women's ways of working: Circumventing the masculine structures operating within and upon the university. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 61, 123-131.
- Yaghi, A., & Bates, R. (2020). The role of supervisor and peer support in training transfer in institutions of higher education. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 24(2), 89-104.
- Yamnull, S., & McLean, G. N. (2001). Theories supporting transfer of training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(2), 195-208.

Yang, B. (2004). Can adult learning theory provide a foundation for human resource development? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 6(2), 129-145.

Yang, M., Lowell, V. L., Talafha, A. M., & Harbor, J. (2020). Transfer of training, trainee attitudes and best practices in training design: A multiple-case study. *TechTrends*, 64(2), 280-301.

Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Pearson Education.

Zhao, X., Chen, L., & Maes, J. H. (2018). Training and transfer effects of response inhibition training in children and adults. *Developmental Science*, 21(1), 1-



BIODATA OF STUDENT

Nurul Afiqah Zulkifly
Lot ***, Batu ***, Kg. ***** ***,
***** Rembau,
Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia.

*****@gmail.com

Biodata

Nurul Afiqah Zulkifly, 29, was born in Seremban, Negeri Sembilan. In 2004, she has the opportunity to join Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan King George V, Seremban, Negeri Sembilan. In 2010, she was enrolled in the Foundation Studies of Economics and Management Sciences program at the International Islamic University, Malaysia. She obtained her bachelor degree in Business Administration, specialising in Human Resource Management in 2015. Due to her deep interest in the field of human resources, she pursued her higher education at master's level and was awarded with the degree of Master of Science in Human Resource Development in 2017. She is now continuing her studies in Human Resource Development as a PhD candidate.

Education

Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)

Master of Science (Human Resource Development)

Thesis: "Factors Influencing Knowledge Transfer between Expatriates and Host Country Nationals"

Committee: Prof. Dr. Maimunah Ismail (Chair)

Dr. Siti Raba'ah Hamzah

Date of viva voce: 26 July 2017

International Islamic University of Malaysia (IIUM)

Bachelor of Business Administration Honors (Human Resource Management),
2015

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Scopus:

Zulkifly, N. A., Ismail, I. A., & Asimiran, S. (2020). Collegial and distributed leadership: two sides of the same coin? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1-14. (Published online)
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1804623>

Zulkifly, N. A., Ismail, I. A., Asimiran, S., Alias, S. N., & Ismail, M. (2020). Working together as equals: Collegiality expectations among academics at a public university in Malaysia. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1-15. (Accepted for publication)

Excellence for Research in Australia (ERA):

Zulkifly, N. A., Ismail, I. A., Asimiran, S., & Alias, S. N. (2021). Factors influencing transfer of training among academics in universities in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 10(2), 184-200. (Published)
<http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v10-i2/9686>



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

STATUS CONFIRMATION FOR THESIS / PROJECT REPORT AND COPYRIGHT

ACADEMIC SESSION : _____

TITLE OF THESIS / PROJECT REPORT :

NAME OF STUDENT : _____

I acknowledge that the copyright and other intellectual property in the thesis/project report belonged to Universiti Putra Malaysia and I agree to allow this thesis/project report to be placed at the library under the following terms:

1. This thesis/project report is the property of Universiti Putra Malaysia.
2. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia has the right to make copies for educational purposes only.
3. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia is allowed to make copies of this thesis for academic exchange.

I declare that this thesis is classified as :

*Please tick (v)

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

(Contain confidential information under Official Secret Act 1972).

☐

RESTRICTED

(Contains restricted information as specified by the organization/institution where research was done).

☒

OPEN ACCESS

I agree that my thesis/project report to be published as hard copy or online open access.

This thesis is submitted for :

☐

PATENT

Embargo from _____ until _____
(date) (date)

Approved by:

(Signature of Student)
New IC No/ Passport No.:

Date :

(Signature of Chairman of Supervisory Committee)
Name:

Date :

[Note : If the thesis is **CONFIDENTIAL** or **RESTRICTED**, please attach with the letter from the organization/institution with period and reasons for confidentiality or restricted.]