Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2582-7472

ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts
Special Issue on Emerging Trends and Innovations
Across Multidisciplinary Research 7(9s)

CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE: AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHY OF LEADING AN EXTERNAL CAMPUS IN A STATE UNIVERSITY

Hanlie A. Taha [1]

[1] Palawan State University (PSU) Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines

Received 19 February 2026
Accepted 22 April 2026
Published 11 May 2026

Corresponding Author
Hanlie A. Taha,
htaha@psu.palawan.edu.ph

DOI
10.29121/shodhkosh.v7.i9s.2026.8048

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

This autoethnographic study explores leadership in external campuses of a Philippine State University and College (SUC) system through my lived experiences across multiple administrative roles over two decades. Serving at different points as a founding campus director, campus director, dean of south campuses, and cluster dean, I experienced leadership from shifting positional vantage points within a multi-level governance structure marked by centralized authority, limited autonomy, resource scarcity, and overlapping jurisdictions. These roles allowed me to witness how policies are interpreted, negotiated, and enacted across institutional layers and local contexts. Using reflective narratives, memory work, and analytic memoing as primary sources of data, I examined how leadership is practiced in everyday administrative life. Five interrelated themes emerged: navigating multi-level governance and policy tensions; strategic adaptation and problem-solving leadership; relational leadership and stakeholder engagement; identity building and campus culture formation; and leadership resilience and professional wisdom. The findings reveal that leadership in external campuses is not merely administrative or procedural but deeply relational, adaptive, and symbolic. Directors function as boundary-spanning actors who translate centralized mandates into locally meaningful practices while sustaining institutional legitimacy and campus identity. By situating personal experience within broader organizational structures, this study contributes to higher education leadership and governance scholarship in the Philippine context. It demonstrates how leadership agency is exercised within bureaucratic constraints and underscores the importance of recognizing external campus leadership as central to equitable and inclusive higher education.

Keywords: Autoethnography, Higher Education Leadership, Multi-Campus Governance, Bureaucratic Leadership, Philippine State Universities and Colleges

1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership in state universities has always felt like navigating a labyrinth, especially within the context of the Global South, where institutions operate under heavy state regulation, limited budgets, and competing mandates related to access, equity, and regional development. In my experience as an external campus director and Dean, I quickly realized that the ideal of smooth governance described in textbooks often clashes with the everyday realities of managing a campus at the periphery of institutional authority. While state university systems are structured to distribute responsibility across central administrations, cluster units, and individual campuses, this layered governance often left me "caught in the middle"—struggling to reconcile centrally imposed policies with the unique needs and constraints of my campus.

From my vantage point, the challenges of leadership were not abstract concepts but lived tensions. I constantly balanced the demands of university-wide performance metrics with the uneven capacities of our faculty, the expectations of cluster-level supervisors, and the practical limitations of our resources. There were moments when I felt constrained by bureaucratic oversight, frustrated by unclear directives, or uncertain about how to advocate for my campus without overstepping authority. Yet, these very tensions also shaped my understanding of leadership as an adaptive, relational practice: one that requires negotiation, sense-making, and a willingness to improvise in the face of ambiguity.

External campuses, I learned, occupy a fragile space within the university ecosystem. We are tasked with translating centralized policies into meaningful action on the ground, while simultaneously articulating a campus identity that resonates with our students, faculty, and local community. At times, I felt that my role extended far beyond operational administration; I was mediating between multiple stakeholders, advocating for resources, and seeking ways to foster a sense of belonging and coherence within our campus culture. The dual accountability of answering to both central administration and cluster-level authorities often left me reflecting on the limits of hierarchical governance and the importance of adaptive leadership practices.

Through my experiences, I began to see leadership not as a set of fixed competencies but as a process of ongoing negotiation—between policies and context, between expectation and reality, between institutional mandate and local needs. By examining these lived experiences, I hope to illuminate how external campus directors navigate the complex terrain of multi-layered governance, manage competing priorities, and sustain institutional coherence under resource and structural constraints. In doing so, I aim to offer insights that are not only theoretically significant—highlighting complexity, ambidexterity, and paradox in leadership—but also practically relevant, informing policies, support structures, and leadership development tailored to the unique challenges of peripheral campuses. Having this, I aim to accomplish the following:

1) Examine the governance and policy challenges faced by external campus directors.
2) Identify leadership strategies used to manage operational and resource constraints.
3) Analyze relational and participatory leadership practices with internal and external stakeholders.
4) Explore processes of campus identity and culture formation; and
5) Document the professional wisdom and resilience developed through leadership practice.

2. METHODS

This study employed an autoethnographic approach to explore leadership within a Philippine state university multi-campus system through my own lived experiences. My position within the system over nearly two decades allowed me to observe and participate in the enactment of leadership at multiple levels, providing rich insights into the interplay between governance, policy implementation, and campus identity formation.

I began as the founding campus director from 2004 to 2010, navigating the challenges of establishing a new campus, building faculty and community relationships, and translating centralized policies into local practice. In 2011, I transitioned to the role of Dean of South Campuses (2011–2015), which expanded my perspective to cluster-level governance, multi-campus coordination, and resource allocation across diverse campuses. I returned to my original campus as Director from 2022 to 2023, re-engaging directly with day-to-day operations and witnessing firsthand the evolving challenges of policy implementation and community engagement. Most recently, I served as Cluster Dean (2023–2025), tasked with aligning cluster-wide strategies, supporting campus directors, and reconciling competing demands between central administration and peripheral campuses.

Throughout these overlapping and sequential experiences, I maintained reflective journals, memos, and personal field notes to document daily leadership decisions, interactions with faculty and administrators, challenges in navigating multi-level governance, and reflections on institutional identity. These records formed the primary "data" for analysis, providing a window into how authority, accountability, and leadership practices were enacted, negotiated, and adapted over time. I also consulted institutional documents, including policy manuals, organizational charts, and administrative communications, to contextualize my reflections within the formal governance structures of the university.

Data analysis followed reflexive thematic reflection, identifying recurring patterns and insights across my experiences and clustering them into overarching themes. Reflexive memos were used to examine my positionality,

assumptions, and emotional responses, ensuring that interpretation remained grounded in lived experience while connecting personal narratives to broader theoretical constructs in leadership studies. Ethical considerations focused on self-disclosure and the protection of others: colleagues, faculty, and campuses are anonymized through pseudonyms, and sensitive institutional information is handled with care. This autoethnographic approach thus centers my personal journey across multiple leadership roles as both the source and lens of inquiry, offering a nuanced understanding of how leadership is enacted, learned, and adapted within the complexities of multi-layered university governance.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Through my years navigating leadership roles in the state university system—from founding campus director to dean of multiple campuses, and later as cluster dean—I experienced firsthand the complexities of multi-level governance. Balancing centralized directives with cluster-level interventions often placed me in a position of dual accountability, where policies sometimes conflicted, authority overlapped, and decision-making felt constrained.

Navigating Multi-Level Governance and Policy Tensions. At the central level, I found myself operating within a Weberian bureaucratic framework shaped by legal–rational authority and New Public Management principles. Compliance, standardization, and managerial oversight were emphasized, often leaving little room for local discretion. I vividly recall the pressure to "follow standard procedures" while simultaneously trying to address the unique needs of my campus. Upholding institutional standards required a constant negotiation between adhering to formal rules and adapting them to the local context. These experiences made me acutely aware of the tension between formal authority and leadership autonomy: while I was responsible for ensuring procedural compliance, I also had to interpret policies in ways that were meaningful and feasible for my faculty, staff, and students.

At the cluster level, my experience was equally complex. Cluster authorities exercised hierarchical oversight over staffing, budgeting, and operations—sometimes privileging larger campuses and creating subtle jurisdictional conflicts. I often felt my authority as director challenged, as interventions from the cluster sometimes undermined decisions I had made based on intimate knowledge of my campus context. Over time, I learned that leadership in such settings required strategic discretion: translating formal directives into actionable plans, negotiating priorities with higher authorities, and mediating between rigid policy frameworks and the lived realities of campus life. This balancing act highlighted the relational and interpretive dimensions of leadership, reminding me that sustaining institutional functionality often depended on dialogue, compromise, and practical creativity.

Strategic Adaptation and Problem-Solving Leadership. Resource scarcity became a daily test of adaptive leadership. With limited budgets and rigid allocation rules, I often had to prioritize "basic needs" over ambitious projects, making trade-offs that were administratively compliant but contextually sensitive. There were moments when I felt frustrated by the structural constraints, yet these same constraints pushed me to be resourceful—finding ways to stretch resources, leverage community support, and maximize the impact of every decision. Budget management, I realized, was not just a technical exercise; it was a site where leadership, negotiation, and bureaucratic rationality intersected.

Relational Leadership and Stakeholder Engagement. Across all my roles, I discovered that leadership was inherently relational. Whether coordinating with faculty, supporting staff, or engaging with local communities, building trust and fostering participation was essential. I recall instances where careful listening, participatory planning, and culturally sensitive engagement not only facilitated smoother policy implementation but also reinforced the identity and cohesion of the campus community. These experiences emphasized that leadership cannot rely solely on rules or directives; it requires empathy, diplomacy, and ongoing dialogue.

Identity Formation and Leadership Resilience. Over time, I observed how campus identity and leadership resilience were deeply intertwined. As director, I felt the immediacy of local challenges and the weight of personal accountability; as dean, I navigated structural pressures and governance tensions across multiple campuses; as cluster dean, I balanced competing demands while supporting other leaders. Each role required reflection, self-grounding, and adaptability, fostering professional wisdom and resilience. The process of negotiating authority, interpreting policy, and managing relationships revealed to me that effective leadership in multi-layered governance is less about autonomy and more about strategic mediation, contextual adaptation, and sustaining legitimacy within the system.

Reflection on Leadership Practice. Reflecting on these experiences, I see how leadership in a state university system is both constrained and enabled by bureaucracy. Bureaucratic authority, formal procedures, and hierarchical structures provide order and legitimacy, but they also create friction when local realities demand flexibility. My lived experience

demonstrates that leadership in such contexts is an adaptive, relational, and reflective practice, where agency emerges not from circumventing rules but from strategically interpreting and applying them in ways that sustain institutional functionality, campus identity, and community engagement.

4. STAFFING AND OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY

In my experience as a campus director, staffing was always one of the most persistent challenges. While bureaucratic theory assumes clearly defined positions, formal appointment procedures, and stable personnel structures, the reality at my campus often diverged from this ideal. We relied heavily on contractual faculty, and permanent positions were few. I remember having to stretch my limited staff across multiple functions—teaching, administrative support, and community engagement—just to keep operations running. This constant juggling created tension: I was responsible for ensuring compliance with institutional standards, yet I had little authority over hiring or deployment decisions.

I realized that effective leadership in this context required practical discretion. I had to adapt rigid staffing rules to the realities of our campus, assigning roles creatively and supporting contractual personnel as fully as possible within the limits of formal authority. There were moments of frustration, knowing that the centralized system valued uniformity over local needs, but these constraints also taught me how to exercise agency within bureaucracy. By creatively managing personnel, I sustained campus programs and services, preserving operational continuity without challenging the legitimacy of the broader system. Reflecting on this now, I see a central tension in higher education leadership: the balance between administrative control and functional effectiveness. Leadership is not simply about authority; it is about negotiating structures, stretching resources, and finding adaptive solutions to ensure that the campus can function effectively within bureaucratic constraints. Adaptive Planning and Localized Solutions. Strategic planning in my campus leadership roles always involved navigating between formal frameworks and local realities. While university policies and cluster-level plans provided the official roadmap, I quickly learned that strict adherence was often impractical due to limited resources, staffing constraints, or contextual challenges unique to our campus. For example, I often had to adapt cluster-aligned plans, submitting formal requests or position papers when strict compliance was impossible, rather than bypassing institutional protocols.

These experiences highlighted a form of mediated adaptation: translating abstract rules into practical, context-sensitive actions while remaining within bureaucratic boundaries. I came to appreciate that this discretion is not rebellion but a necessary part of effective governance. By aligning our campus plans with broader cluster frameworks while advocating for local adjustments, I could maintain institutional coherence and accountability while responding to the immediate needs of faculty, students, and the community. This process reinforced an important lesson: leadership in bureaucratic organizations is less about circumventing rules and more about working creatively within them. Adaptive planning became a space where I could exercise judgment, balance formal authority with local exigencies, and ensure that the campus continued to function effectively. Looking back, these experiences illustrate how localized problem-solving and strategic flexibility are essential components of sustaining leadership and institutional effectiveness within multi-level governance structures.

5. STAFFING AND OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY

In my experience as a campus director, staffing was always one of the most persistent challenges. While bureaucratic theory assumes clearly defined positions, formal appointment procedures, and stable personnel structures, the reality at my campus often diverged from this ideal. We relied heavily on contractual faculty, and permanent positions were few. I remember having to stretch my limited staff across multiple functions—teaching, administrative support, and community engagement—just to keep operations running. This constant juggling created tension: I was responsible for ensuring compliance with institutional standards, yet I had little authority over hiring or deployment decisions.

I realized that effective leadership in this context required practical discretion. I had to adapt rigid staffing rules to the realities of our campus, assigning roles creatively and supporting contractual personnel as fully as possible within the limits of formal authority. There were moments of frustration, knowing that the centralized system valued uniformity over local needs, but these constraints also taught me how to exercise agency within bureaucracy. By creatively managing personnel, I sustained campus programs and services, preserving operational continuity without challenging the legitimacy of the broader system. Reflecting on this now, I see a central tension in higher education leadership: the balance between administrative control and functional effectiveness. Leadership is not simply about authority; it is about

negotiating structures, stretching resources, and finding adaptive solutions to ensure that the campus can function effectively within bureaucratic constraints.

6. ADAPTIVE PLANNING AND LOCALIZED SOLUTIONS

Strategic planning in my campus leadership roles always involved navigating between formal frameworks and local realities. While university policies and cluster-level plans provided the official roadmap, I quickly learned that strict adherence was often impractical due to limited resources, staffing constraints, or contextual challenges unique to our campus. For example, I often had to adapt cluster-aligned plans, submitting formal requests or position papers when strict compliance was impossible, rather than bypassing institutional protocols. Walode (2025)

These experiences highlighted a form of mediated adaptation: translating abstract rules into practical, context-sensitive actions while remaining within bureaucratic boundaries. I came to appreciate that this discretion is not rebellion but a necessary part of effective governance. By aligning our campus plans with broader cluster frameworks while advocating for local adjustments, I could maintain institutional coherence and accountability while responding to the immediate needs of faculty, students, and the community. This process reinforced an important lesson: leadership in bureaucratic organizations is less about circumventing rules and more about working creatively within them. Adaptive planning became a space where I could exercise judgment, balance formal authority with local exigencies, and ensure that the campus continued to function effectively. Looking back, these experiences illustrate how localized problem-solving and strategic flexibility are essential components of sustaining leadership and institutional effectiveness within multi-level governance structures.

7. RELATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Throughout my leadership journey in external campuses, I realized that effective leadership is fundamentally relational. Sustaining operations, building morale, and ensuring smooth implementation of policies depended as much on trust, collaboration, and engagement as on formal authority. My reflections reveal that leadership is enacted not only through compliance with rules but also through fostering meaningful connections with both internal and external stakeholders.

1) **Internal Engagement and Participatory Leadership.** Within my campus, I consistently relied on participatory practices to manage faculty, staff, and administrative operations. Regular consultations, team meetings, and transparent communication became essential routines. I remember convening weekly sessions where matters were informed, discussed, and assigned actionable steps. These interactions were not just about following procedure—they were a deliberate strategy to translate abstract policies into workable practices while maintaining alignment with institutional standards.

Even when directives originated from higher levels, I often had to exercise discretion, coordinating with faculty and staff to ensure smooth implementation. I found that involving others in decision-making built trust, reduced resistance, and reinforced legitimacy. I came to appreciate that participatory engagement is not outside the bureaucratic system; rather, it strengthens it by aligning formal authority with the lived realities of campus life. Through these practices, I acted as an intermediary, balancing adherence to rules with collaborative leadership that fostered cooperation and shared understanding.

2) **External Partnerships and Community Building.** Engaging external stakeholders—local government units (LGUs), alumni, and community organizations—was another critical dimension of relational leadership. I often reminded myself that my authority in these spaces derived from my official role, not personal charisma. For example, I made deliberate efforts to build strong relationships with LGUs, understanding that their support was essential for resources, outreach programs, and the broader legitimacy of the campus. These interactions required strategic thinking and procedural alignment: outreach and partnership initiatives had to be formally sanctioned, documented, and aligned with institutional objectives. In practice, I became a boundary-spanning actor, representing the university while navigating the social, political, and cultural expectations of the community. These engagements reinforced my belief that leadership extends beyond internal administration—it is also about embedding the institution within the community in ways that are both legitimate and effective.

3) **Professionalism and Diplomacy.** At every stage, maintaining professionalism and exercising diplomacy were central to my leadership approach. There were moments of conflict or disagreement, both internally and externally, where personal emotions could have derailed decision-making. I consciously reminded myself to remain professional, objective, and focused, ensuring that personal sentiments did not compromise institutional goals. At the same time, I relied on diplomacy to navigate hierarchical complexities. I would occasionally engage higher officials informally to advocate for campus needs or clarify expectations, always carefully balancing tact with adherence to formal procedures. Over time, I realized that effective leadership in such a bureaucratic environment requires both rule-bound conduct and relational sensitivity. Professionalism and diplomacy allowed me to uphold institutional legitimacy while subtly advancing the interests of my campus.
4) **Reflection on Relational Leadership.** Looking back, I understand that relational leadership was not merely a personal style; it was a practical necessity within the multi-layered bureaucracy. Participatory engagement, external partnerships, and disciplined diplomacy became mechanisms for sustaining operational effectiveness, preserving legitimacy, and fostering trust across all levels of the university system. These experiences reinforced an essential insight: leadership is relational, adaptive, and contextually grounded, enabling organizational goals to be achieved without undermining formal authority or institutional stability.

8. STEWARDSHIP OF CAMPUS IDENTITY: VISION, VALUES, AND LEGITIMATION

Across my years as campus director and dean, I came to understand leadership not merely as administrative coordination but as stewardship of institutional identity. One of my most persistent responsibilities was promoting the university's vision and values—often through orientations, policy briefings, and formal meetings. At the time, these practices felt routine, even procedural. In retrospect, however, they reveal how legitimacy is cultivated within a legal–rational bureaucratic system.

Reading my experience through Weber's theory of bureaucracy (1947), I now see these activities as acts of legitimation. Vision and mission statements functioned as normative anchors, justifying authority and guiding conduct within the institution. As a director, I was not merely transmitting information; I was socializing faculty, staff, and students into an institutional order defined by rules, roles, and expectations. This process reinforced predictability and coherence—central features of Weberian bureaucracy—but it also required relational work to make abstract ideals meaningful at the campus level.

Over time, I realized that leadership could not rely on instrumental rationality alone. My deliberate emphasis on values such as excellence, integrity, and service reflected what Weber termed value rationality (Wertrationalität)—action guided by belief in the intrinsic worth of certain principles. These values sustained morale and commitment in ways that formal rules could not. Acting as a carrier of rational–legal authority, I found myself constantly translating institutional ideals into locally resonant practices, mediating between centralized mandates and lived campus realities.

1) **Community Engagement and Recognition as Bureaucratic Integration.** My leadership experience also revealed the limits of impersonal bureaucracy. While formal procedures structured everyday operations, they were insufficient for fostering cohesion and commitment. I therefore initiated and supported recognition programs, campus competitions, and engagement platforms that encouraged dialogue and interpersonal connection. Through an autoethnographic lens, these practices emerge as mechanisms of social integration within bureaucracy. Weber acknowledged that bureaucratic systems depend not only on rules but on shared acceptance of authority. By recognizing outstanding performance and creating spaces for interaction, I sought to reinforce that acceptance—not through coercion, but through affirmation. These moments of recognition humanized the institution, signaling that individual contributions mattered within the formal order.

Initiatives such as campus-wide dialogues allowed me to manage tensions, clarify policy interpretations, and align expectations across hierarchical levels. Although bureaucracy is often associated with impersonality, my experience suggests that relational practices are essential for bureaucratic stability. By embedding values like collegiality and service into everyday institutional life, I complemented instrumental rationality with normative meaning, strengthening legitimacy from within.

2) **Identity Challenges and the Constraints of Centralized Authority.** Despite these efforts, I repeatedly encountered structural constraints that shaped—and often limited—campus identity. As a director of a peripheral campus, I became acutely aware of how bureaucratic centralization defines legitimacy. My campus was frequently

described, implicitly or explicitly, as an "extension" of the main campus. This labeling reduced its identity to an administrative function rather than recognizing it as a distinct academic and cultural space. From a Weberian perspective, this reflects how legal–rational authority assigns meaning through hierarchy and jurisdiction. Identity, in such systems, is not self-generated but structurally conferred. Decisions made at the center—particularly inconsistent rule interpretations or selective policy approvals reinforced perceptions of inequity. Although bureaucratic rules are meant to be impersonal, my experience confirmed that discretion in implementation profoundly affects morale and legitimacy. These tensions revealed a fundamental contradiction: while bureaucratic rationalization promotes efficiency and control, it can suppress the symbolic recognition necessary for sub-units to flourish. Without sanctioned autonomy and institutional acknowledgment, campuses struggle to cultivate a meaningful identity, remaining dependent on central authority for validation.

Having these experiences, I now see my leadership journey as a continuous negotiation between authority and belonging, control and meaning. Autoethnography allows me to situate these negotiations within my own lived practice, while Weberian theory provides a language to interpret their structural roots. Together, they reveal that leadership in higher education bureaucracy is not simply about managing systems, but about sustaining legitimacy, identity, and human connection within them.

9. LEADERSHIP RESILIENCE AND PROFESSIONAL WISDOM

As I moved through different leadership roles, campus director, dean, and cluster dean, I learned early that effectiveness depended on knowing my mandate and grounding myself within the context of my assignment. Each position came with clearly defined directives, yet the meaning of those directives shifted depending on campus conditions, available resources, and institutional politics. Understanding where my authority began and ended was not merely administrative clarity; it was essential for survival.

Through Weber's concept of rational–legal authority (1978), I now recognize this practice as an internalization of office competence (Amtskompetenz). Leadership required disciplined adherence to formal responsibilities, but also restraint, knowing when to act, when to wait, and when to accept limitations imposed by hierarchy. At times, this demanded a conscious separation of personal frustration from official conduct, reflecting Weber's notion of bureaucratic impersonality. However, sustaining this neutrality was emotionally taxing. Over time, I realized that self-grounding physically, emotionally, and even spiritually was not optional. Administrative pressure, resource scarcity, and constant accountability made burnout a real risk. Attending to my well-being became a coping mechanism that allowed me to perform my role with consistency and sound judgment. In Weberian terms, this self-discipline enabled me to meet the expectations of bureaucratic leadership without compromising professional integrity.

I also came to see leadership as a vocation (Beruf) rather than merely a position. Accepting my assignment—especially when it involved peripheral campuses—required humility and resilience. This vocational orientation helped reconcile personal well-being with institutional duty, allowing me to remain grounded while navigating the demands of rational–legal authority.

1) **Relationship Building and Advocacy Within Bureaucratic Constraints.** While bureaucracy is formally rule-bound, my experience taught me that leadership is enacted relationally. Building trust with central administration, fellow directors, and external partners such as local government units was essential for translating formal authority into tangible outcomes. Policies alone rarely moved resources; relationships did. Viewed through Weber, this did not contradict bureaucratic principles. As an official (Beamter), my responsibility was to represent the interests of my office while maintaining loyalty to the institution. Advocacy, therefore, became a legitimate bureaucratic practice—not resistance, but responsible engagement. Negotiating for campus needs, clarifying policy interpretations, and mobilizing external support were ways of ensuring equitable application of rules within the system.

I was careful to distinguish relationship building from favoritism. Trust-based cooperation functioned as a mechanism for predictability and coordination, not personal gain. These relationships reduced friction, facilitated compliance, and enabled smoother execution of formal mandates. In this sense, relational intelligence complemented Weberian impersonality rather than undermining it. Advocacy also reinforced my sense of duty to the office. Speaking for my campus through proper bureaucratic channels was an ethical obligation, especially in contexts where peripheral

units were structurally disadvantaged. Through sustained engagement, I learned that bureaucratic leadership requires both procedural discipline and relational skill.

2) **Strategic Foresight and Mission-Driven Leadership.** As my responsibilities expanded, I increasingly recognized the importance of thinking beyond immediate constraints while remaining anchored to institutional mission. Encouraging innovation—sometimes described as "thinking outside the box"—did not mean abandoning rules. Instead, it involved adapting methods while remaining faithful to formally defined goals. Weber's concept of goal-oriented rationality (Zweckrationalität) helps clarify this practice. Innovation, in my experience, was always purposive. New approaches were pursued only insofar as they strengthened the university's capacity to fulfill its educational mandate. Creativity was instrumental, not arbitrary.

Mission-driven leadership also demanded perseverance. Limited resources, delayed approvals, and bureaucratic inertia tested commitment. Yet these challenges reinforced my sense of leadership as a vocation. Acting in service of institutional goals—rather than personal advancement—sustained my motivation even when incentives were minimal. Strategic foresight, I found, contributed to bureaucratic stability rather than disruption. By anticipating challenges and encouraging adaptive thinking, I sought to protect continuity and coherence within the system. In this way, Weberian bureaucracy proved compatible with adaptability, provided that innovation remained aligned with institutional purpose.

10. CONCLUSIONS

This autoethnographic study illuminates my multifaceted leadership experiences as a campus director and later as dean within Palawan State University's decentralized higher education system. Drawing from sustained self-reflection across multiple leadership roles and periods, I examined how leadership is enacted, negotiated, and learned in the context of managing external campuses. Through reflexive thematic analysis of my experiences responding to institutional demands, community realities, and policy constraints, five interrelated themes emerged: (1) navigating multi-level governance and policy tensions, (2) strategic adaptation and problem-solving leadership, (3) relational leadership and stakeholder engagement, (4) identity building and campus culture formation, and (5) leadership resilience and professional wisdom.

My leadership journey unfolded within a dynamic and often constrained space marked by limited autonomy, chronic resource shortages, and overlapping lines of authority. Operating at the periphery of the university system required constant negotiation between compliance and contextual responsiveness. Over time, I learned that effectiveness did not rest solely on positional authority or policy knowledge, but on adaptability, relational intelligence, and the ability to read institutional and community landscapes simultaneously. Leadership, in this context, was never purely administrative. It was deeply symbolic and relational—shaping campus identity, cultivating pride and belonging, and advocating for the legitimacy and relevance of external campuses within a highly centralized system. Whether mediating between central administration and local stakeholders or fostering internal cohesion amid uncertainty, I experienced leadership as a practice of meaning-making as much as management.

These reflections affirm that leadership in external campuses demands more than procedural compliance with institutional directives. It requires contextual sensitivity, collaborative engagement, ethical perseverance, and a resilient commitment to educational equity—particularly for geographically and structurally marginalized communities. Autoethnography made visible how leadership is learned not through formal training alone, but through lived tension, adaptation, and sustained moral labor. By situating personal experience within broader organizational structures, this study contributes to discussions on distributed leadership and institutional complexity in higher education, particularly in the Philippine context. It also calls attention to the need for structural and policy reforms that more fully recognize, support, and empower external campus leaders as central—rather than peripheral—actors in advancing inclusive access to quality public higher education and national development.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. Jossey-Bass.

Blau, P. M. (1955). The dynamics of bureaucracy. University of Chicago Press.

Blau, P. M. (1970). A formal theory of differentiation in organizations. American Sociological Review, 35(2), 201–218. https://doi.org/10.2307/2093199

Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2009). Distributed leadership in higher education: Rhetoric and reality. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 37(2), 257–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143208100301

Clark, B. R. (1983). The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective. University of California Press.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism. Oxford University Press.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern organizations. Prentice-Hall.

Hood, C. (1995). The "new public management" in the 1980s: Variations on a theme. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 20(2–3), 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682(93)E0001-W

Kalberg, S. (1980). Max Weber's types of rationality: Cornerstones for the analysis of rationalization processes in history. American Journal of Sociology, 85(5), 1145–1179.

Middlehurst, R. (2013). Changing internal governance: Are leadership roles and management structures in United Kingdom universities fit for the future? Higher Education Quarterly, 67(3), 275–294. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12018

Mintzberg, H. (1979). The structuring of organizations. Prentice Hall.

Tight, M. (2014). Collegiality and managerialism: A false dichotomy? Tertiary Education and Management, 20(4), 294–306. https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2014.956788

Walode, R. G. (2025). An Analytical Study of the Relationship Between Risk Management Aand Financial Performance. ShodhPrabandhan: Journal of Management Studies. 2(2), 93–100. https://doi.org/10.29121/ShodhPrabandhan.v2.i2.2025.55

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization (T. Parsons, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1922