

Original Article

Leadership Practices of Generation Z Higher Education Office Heads in Promoting Organizational Success

Rhea Camille Tabanay ¹, Life Gabriel Osumo ^{2,*}, John Rowuel Palabrica ²

Received: 26 July 2026; Revised: 04 September 2026;

Accepted: 08 September 2026; Published: 14 September 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.66074/X4B7V1C8K>

Abstract

The emergence of Generation Z professionals in leadership roles marks an important shift in higher education, yet little is known about how they lead within the Philippine context. This study explored the leadership practices, challenges, and conceptualizations of effective leadership among Generation Z office heads in higher education institutions in North Cotabato, Philippines. Guided by Mannheim's Generational Theory, Social Exchange Theory, Transformational Leadership Theory, and Leader-Member Exchange Theory, the study used a qualitative descriptive design. Fifteen Generation Z office heads were purposively selected through maximum variation sampling. Face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted in Bisaya, audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, translated into English, and analyzed using Braun and Clarke's six-phase thematic analysis. Results showed that leadership practices were characterized by collaborative-participative leadership, communication-centered leadership, structured yet flexible management, and empowerment and trust-building. The challenges encountered included generational and authority gap, resistance to change and innovation, team diversity and dynamics, and workload complexity and institutional pressure. Effective leadership was conceptualized as adaptive and innovative, inclusive and empathetic, technology-driven, and collaborative and purpose-driven. The findings show that Generation Z office heads emphasize collaboration, communication, adaptability, empowerment,

¹ Makilala Institute of Science and Technology, Makilala, North Cotabato, Philippines

² Central Mindanao Colleges, Kidapawan City, Philippines

*losumo@cmc.edu.ph

empathy, technology, and shared purpose while managing intergenerational tensions and institutional demands. Their leadership is shaped by generational identity, workplace relationships, institutional expectations, and changing organizational conditions. The study offers context-specific insights for leadership development, mentoring, succession planning, change management, and higher education administration, as well as for future institutional leadership development initiatives. Findings should be interpreted within the institutional and cultural context of North Cotabato.

Keywords: educational leadership; generation Z leadership; perceived leadership effectiveness; Philippine higher education management; transformational leadership

1. Introduction

The emergence of Generation Z professionals in leadership positions within higher education institutions represents a significant organizational shift with strategic implications for institutional performance and sustainability (Tan et al., 2023). As digital natives shaped by rapid technological advancement, social interconnectedness, and evolving workplace expectations, Generation Z leaders are often associated with collaborative decision-making, inclusivity, transparency, and innovation-oriented management (Islam, 2025; Muzulon et al., 2025). However, higher education institutions remain traditionally structured around hierarchical governance, seniority-based authority, and established administrative norms (Hassan et al., 2025; Yoshinaga, 2023). The interaction between these generational characteristics and institutional structures creates a dynamic that warrants systematic and rigorous scholarly examination. This dynamic can be situated against older, foundational management paradigms: Weber's (1947) model of bureaucratic authority emphasized formal rules, hierarchical control, and impersonal decision-making, while Taylor's (1911) scientific management prioritized standardized procedures and top-down supervision. Contemporary participative and relational leadership approaches, by contrast, emphasize shared decision-making, flexibility, and follower development. Positioning Generation Z leadership within this longer trajectory of management thought clarifies what, if anything, is genuinely distinct about how this cohort leads, rather than treating collaborative or communication-oriented practices as unique to a single generation.

From a business management perspective, leadership effectiveness is a critical determinant of organizational success, influencing employee engagement, operational efficiency, innovation capability, and long-term competitiveness (Alrayssi, 2025).

While literature on Generation Z commonly explores workplace values, motivation, and engagement patterns, a first research gap is the limited empirical research examining Generation Z as leaders rather than primarily as employees or followers (Dimokas, 2025; LeBlanc, 2024). A second gap concerns limited qualitative evidence on the leadership experiences and practices of Generation Z leaders as they navigate organizational responsibilities, decision-making, interpersonal relationships, and institutional expectations. Existing studies tend to emphasize generational characteristics, workplace preferences, or leadership orientations, frequently relying on quantitative approaches that may not adequately capture the contextual dimensions of leadership practice.

A third research gap is the limited evidence concerning Generation Z leadership within the Philippine and broader ASEAN higher education contexts. Although international literature provides growing insights into Generation Z and the contemporary workplace, findings from Western and other non-ASEAN contexts cannot necessarily be generalized to higher education institutions in the Philippines, where distinct cultural, organizational, and institutional conditions shape leadership dynamics. In the Philippine higher education system, cultural norms that emphasize hierarchy, relational authority, and respect for tenure further shape leadership dynamics (Batang et al., 2025). As younger leaders assume administrative roles, questions arise regarding leadership legitimacy, intergenerational collaboration, change-management capacity, and their contributions to organizational outcomes (Kurata et al., 2022; Lemana II & Ahmad, 2024).

These gaps highlight the need to examine how Generation Z leaders actually enact and experience leadership within higher education institutions. Without an in-depth understanding of their leadership practices and experiences, particularly from the perspectives of organizational members who directly interact with Generation Z office heads, institutions may struggle to design responsive leadership development programs, effective succession planning strategies, and contextually appropriate management interventions (Azman et al., 2024; Aquino, 2025). Addressing these gaps matters because leadership effectiveness cannot be fully understood through generational characteristics alone; it must also be examined within the specific organizational and cultural contexts in which leadership is practiced.

This study is therefore necessary to provide a contextualized qualitative understanding of the leadership practices and self-reported experiences of Generation Z higher education office heads. Rather than adopting a phenomenological orientation, the study employs a qualitative descriptive design to examine how Generation Z office heads describe their leadership practice and how they navigate the institutional context in which they work. By centering these office heads' accounts—rather than those of the instructors, staff, or other organizational members who experience their leadership—the research seeks to move beyond generational generalizations and to generate context-sensitive insights into how this group of leaders understands leadership effectiveness within academic institutions. The findings are expected to contribute to business and management scholarship by integrating generational cohort

perspectives with leadership frameworks; claims about organizational outcomes are outside this study's evidentiary scope, since no organizational performance data, employee outcomes, or follower/subordinate accounts were collected (see Limitations).

Moreover, the study offers practical value to higher education administrators, policymakers, and human resource practitioners by providing evidence to inform leadership development initiatives, adaptive management practices, and succession planning strategies. In an era of workforce transformation and increasing institutional complexity, understanding how Generation Z leaders experience and enact leadership within higher education is both timely and strategically significant. By addressing the limited empirical, qualitative, and contextual evidence on Generation Z leadership, particularly within Philippine higher education, this study examines the experiences and challenges encountered by Generation Z office heads in performing their leadership roles, the leadership strategies they employ to enhance effectiveness and achieve organizational goals, and the personal and contextual factors they identify as shaping their ability to apply these strategies. It further explores how Generation Z office heads conceptualize effective leadership based on their experiences of leading in higher education administration. Taken together, these areas of inquiry provide a contextual foundation for developing a leadership framework for Generation Z office heads in higher education, contributing to sustainable leadership practices, stronger organizational resilience, and more responsive institutional strategies to develop the next generation of higher education leaders.

This study is primarily anchored in Mannheim's Generational Theory (1952), which posits that individuals who come of age under similar historical and social conditions may develop shared orientations, perspectives, and ways of interpreting their social world. The theory is relevant to the present study because it provides a contextual lens for examining how Generation Z office heads understand and experience leadership within higher education. Rather than assuming that generational membership determines leadership behavior, the study uses Mannheim's perspective as a sensitizing framework for exploring how participants' generational experiences may shape their leadership perspectives, workplace expectations, communication practices, and approaches to decision-making.

The study is also informed by Transformational Leadership Theory, primarily associated with Burns (1978) and further developed by Bass (1985), which emphasizes leaders' capacity to motivate, inspire, and develop others toward shared goals and organizational change. This perspective is relevant to the study because it provides a lens for examining how Generation Z office heads describe their leadership strategies, particularly in motivating colleagues, communicating organizational goals, encouraging innovation, supporting professional development, and responding to institutional challenges. Consistent with the qualitative design, the theory is used as a sensitizing framework rather than a predetermined set of categories, allowing leadership practices and meanings to emerge from participants' experiences.

2. Methodology

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to examine the leadership experiences, strategies, challenges, and perspectives of Generation Z office heads in higher education institutions (HEIs) in North Cotabato, Philippines. The design was appropriate for producing a clear, contextually grounded account of participants' leadership practices and perspectives without imposing predetermined interpretations on their experiences (Sandelowski, 2000; Stanley, 2023). The study involved 15 Generation Z office heads purposively selected through maximum variation sampling to capture variation in institutional type, office classification, leadership experience, and institutional affiliation. Generation Z was operationally defined as individuals born from 1995 to 2009, recognizing that cohort boundaries vary across sources (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Eligible participants were currently serving as office heads or supervisors in HEIs and had at least one year of leadership experience; no graduate-enrollment requirement was imposed. The final sample comprised eight females and seven males; five participants were from public and ten from private HEIs; nine were administrative and six were academic office heads; and participants had one to six years of leadership experience across three HEIs. Recruitment continued until sufficient thematic depth was achieved, as indicated by successive interviews that yielded no substantively new codes or themes relevant to the research questions.

Data were collected through face-to-face, semi-structured interviews conducted over four weeks between August and October 2025, with each interview lasting approximately 30–60 minutes. The interview guide consisted of open-ended questions developed from the research objectives and informed by the study's theoretical perspectives. Before data collection, three validators with expertise in education management, business management, and applied linguistics conducted expert content validation and criterion checking. The researchers incorporated their recommendations to improve the guide's clarity, relevance, contextual appropriateness, ethical suitability, and alignment with the research objectives. The guide was not pilot-tested; its quality was established through expert validation and theoretical cross-validation. Interviews were conducted primarily in Bisaya to facilitate natural and comprehensive expression. Recordings were transcribed verbatim and manually translated into English with guidance from a PhD in Applied Linguistics and a local Bisaya language user; the researchers reviewed and resolved discrepancies.

Data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis, involving familiarization, initial coding, theme development, theme review, theme definition and naming, and report production. Analysis was iterative and researched-led, with final coding, theme construction, interpretation, and conclusions determined through repeated examination of the original transcripts. A second research team

member reviewed the final themes against the raw transcripts to verify their traceability to participants' accounts. The researchers obtained ethical approval and institutional authorization before data collection, and all participants provided written informed consent. Confidentiality, anonymity, voluntary participation, and the right to withdraw were observed, and personal information was handled in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173). The team did not upload identifiable participant information or transcripts to AI platforms. The team used ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini only as supplementary aids for language correction, organizing analytical notes, and preliminarily identifying possible patterns in de-identified data; they did not determine the final codes, themes, interpretations, findings, or conclusions. The team critically checked all AI-assisted suggestions against the original transcripts.

Trustworthiness was addressed through credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability. Credibility was supported by expert validation, interviews conducted in participants' preferred language, verbatim transcription, careful translation, and repeated engagement with the data. Dependability was strengthened through the systematic application of thematic analysis and maintenance of an audit trail documenting methodological and analytical decisions. Confirmability was supported through reflexive notes, transcript-based interpretation, independent thematic review, and researcher control over final analytical decisions. Transferability was enhanced through maximum variation sampling and contextual description of the participants, institutional setting, and research procedures. Throughout the study, the researchers maintained reflexivity regarding their professional and academic positions and their potential influence on data collection and interpretation. These procedures ensured that the findings remained grounded in participants' accounts and the contextual realities of Generation Z leadership in Philippine higher education.

3. Results

3.1 Leadership Practices of Generation Z Office Heads in Academic Settings

The findings on leadership practices are presented in four themes: Collaborative–Participative Leadership, Communication-Centered Leadership, Structured yet Flexible Management, and Empowerment and Trust-Building. These themes describe how participants reported carrying out their leadership responsibilities and interacting with faculty and staff.

Theme 1. Collaborative–Participative Leadership

Participants described involving faculty and staff in decision-making, planning, consultation, and problem-solving. Rather than making decisions independently, they reported creating opportunities for team members to express concerns, contribute ideas, and participate in organizational processes. Participants stated:

“Instead of making a unilateral decision, I initiated a collaborative dialogue... and allowed them to openly share their concerns... As a result, the teaching load became more equitable, and faculty members appreciated being heard.” (#IDI-001)

“I involved each team member in the planning process... giving my co-team members ownership of the process made the team more engaged and motivated.” (#IDI-002)

Theme 2. Communication-Centered Leadership

Participants consistently described communication as central to their leadership practice. They reported explaining the reasons behind policies and decisions, listening to staff concerns, maintaining dialogue, and clarifying expectations, particularly when introducing new procedures or additional responsibilities. Participants explained:

“I make it a point to explain the purpose clearly... ensuring that they understand the reason behind it... the staff become more cooperative, and there is less resistance.” (#IDI-005)

“At first, I had a staff member who was somewhat hesitant about the new reporting procedure... they did not like it because they were already accustomed to the old process or traditional practices based on their experience. So, I explained why we needed to change it... after I explained it, they understood and eventually followed the new procedure.” (#IDI-009)

“There was a time when we needed to implement an additional task because of an urgent requirement in our school... some staff initially questioned it because they were not accustomed to it. I explained that it was only temporary and why their support was important... after that, they became more cooperative and helped each other.” (#IDI-011)

Theme 3. Structured yet Flexible Management

Participants reported maintaining established institutional procedures while making adjustments when circumstances required flexibility. They described following policies and compliance requirements while allowing reasonable modifications to deadlines, procedures, and work arrangements. Participants stated:

"We do have procedures that we need to follow, especially for reports and office transactions. However, sometimes, we really need to adjust depending on the situation." (#IDI-012)

"There was a faculty member who could not submit on time because the internet connection was slow... so I extended the deadline and provided them with another option. The policy is important, but you also need to understand the situation of the employees." (#IDI-014)

"We follow the institutional guidelines because compliance is important. However, if the process is no longer efficient, I allow my staff to suggest changes. During enrollment, we made some adjustments to the procedures because of the students' concerns... as long as we still remain compliant with the university rules." (#IDI-015)

Theme 4. Empowerment and Trust-Building

Participants described delegating responsibilities, providing guidance, encouraging employees to make decisions, and creating an environment where staff could express ideas without fear of making mistakes. They also reported supporting employees' development by giving them opportunities to take on responsibilities. Participants shared:

"I gave her the responsibility of handling an accreditation document... I only guided her, but I let her decide how to organize the work. She was afraid at first because she did not have any experience yet... I told her, 'It's okay to make mistakes; it is part of learning.' After she successfully completed it, she became more confident... and she started volunteering for other tasks." (#IDI-006)

"I always encourage my team to share their ideas... even if they are different from my opinion. A staff member suggested a new way of handling office requests... instead of rejecting the idea, we discussed it as a team. Eventually, we adopted the idea, and the process became more efficient. For me, it is important that they are not afraid to share their ideas... so that they feel they have ownership of their work." (#IDI-008)

3.2 Challenges Encountered by Generation Z Office Heads in Academic Settings

Four themes emerged from participants' accounts of challenges: Generational and Authority Gap, Resistance to Change and Innovation, Team Diversity and Dynamics, and Workload Complexity and Institutional Pressure.

Theme 1. Generational and Authority Gap

Participants described difficulties leading older, more experienced personnel or those accustomed to more hierarchical decision-making. Some participants reported that senior employees initially hesitated to participate in collaborative processes or expected the office head to make decisions independently. Participants stated:

"Some of my senior faculty members resisted the democratic process because they preferred top-down decisions." (#IDI-003)

"At first, some of the older staff would wait for me to tell them exactly what to do... they were used to the supervisor making the decisions. When I asked for their input, they would say, 'You decide, Ma'am'... so I had to gradually encourage them to participate." (#IDI-007)

"During meetings, I noticed that some senior employees were not comfortable when I asked everyone to discuss the issue together... they would say that it would be better if the head made the decision immediately. For them, perhaps that was the usual way of doing things... but I wanted them to feel that their opinions also mattered." (#IDI-010)

Theme 2. Resistance to Change and Innovation

Participants reported encountering hesitation when introducing new systems, procedures, and operational changes. Some employees preferred established processes and expressed concerns about adjusting to unfamiliar systems or additional requirements. Participants mentioned:

"Some employees showed hesitation or resistance, especially if they are used to old systems." (#IDI-005)

"When we shifted to a new online system... some of the older staff had difficulty adjusting. They kept asking if we could still use the old way... so I had to guide them step by step until they became comfortable with the new system." (#IDI-009)

"When we changed some of our office procedures, there was really a staff member who said that the old process was much easier... they were worried that the new procedure might add to their workload. I listened to their concerns first... then we gradually tried implementing the new procedure." (#IDI-013)

Theme 3. Team Diversity and Dynamics

Participants described differences among team members in terms of motivation, communication, participation, work preferences, and levels of independence. These differences required them to adjust how they interacted with individual employees. Participants explained:

“Not everyone is motivated in the same way... there are staff members who need to be constantly encouraged, while others can work independently. I try to understand what works best for each person.” (#IDI-014)

“There are employees who are very active and always volunteer... while others just do what is assigned. I had to find ways to involve the quieter ones without making them feel pressured.” (#IDI-015)

Theme 4. Workload Complexity and Institutional Pressure

Participants described managing multiple responsibilities simultaneously, including staff supervision, meetings, reports, compliance requirements, institutional activities, and regular office operations. They reported difficulty prioritizing tasks when several demands arose at the same time. Participants shared:

“There are so many tasks that need to be handled simultaneously... you have to supervise the staff, attend meetings, and still complete your own reports. Sometimes, you do not know which one to prioritize first.” (#IDI-002)

“The reports alone can already take so much time... there are also compliance requirements and deadlines. Sometimes, you have to set aside other office concerns just to complete what is required.” (#IDI-004)

“There are times when there are so many activities from the university... but the regular office work continues. So, you really have to manage your time because you cannot neglect either one.” (#IDI-010)

3.3 Conceptualization of Effective Leadership among Generation Z Office Heads

Participants conceptualized effective leadership through four themes: Adaptive and Innovative Leadership, Inclusive and Empathetic Leadership, Technology-Driven Leadership, and Collaborative and Purpose-Driven Leadership.

Theme 1. Adaptive and Innovative Leadership

Participants described effective leaders as flexible, open to new approaches, and able to adjust leadership practices in response to changing circumstances. They reported adopting new systems, modifying procedures, and considering staff suggestions. Participants explained:

“Effective leadership is grounded in adaptability, innovation, and empathy.” (#IDI-002)

“We noticed that the manual process was taking too long... so I suggested using an online system. At first, it was an adjustment for the staff, but eventually, the work became easier and more convenient.” (#IDI-010)

“I do not want to say that ‘this is simply how the process should be’... if there is a better way, I am willing to listen and try it. Sometimes, you learn from the staff themselves.” (#IDI-014)

Theme 2. Inclusive and Empathetic Leadership

Participants associated effective leadership with fairness, respect, listening, understanding employees’ circumstances, and providing appropriate support. They described considering employees’ perspectives before making decisions and responding to workplace concerns through dialogue. Participants emphasized:

“I try to treat everyone equally... not because you are close to someone, you will automatically favor that person. For me, assignments and decisions must always be fair.” (#IDI-007)

“There was a time when two staff members had a misunderstanding... instead of immediately looking for who was at fault, I talked to them separately first. I wanted to understand both sides before making a decision.” (#IDI-011)

“If I notice that a staff member is struggling, I do not immediately pressure them... I ask what happened and what kind of support they need. Sometimes, simply listening to them is already a big help.” (#IDI-013)

Theme 3. Technology-Driven Leadership

Participants identified technology use as an important component of contemporary leadership. They described using digital platforms for communication, online systems for administrative processes, and technology-enabled channels for responding to students and other stakeholders. Participants highlighted:

"It is much easier to communicate now because of Messenger and other online platforms. If there is an announcement or an urgent concern, I can reach the staff immediately." (#IDI-006)

"We started using online forms instead of asking them to submit everything manually... mas paspas ang process, and we can easily track who has already submitted." (#IDI-009)

"Sometimes students message the office online because they cannot come personally... so I respond or assign someone to assist them. It makes the service more accessible." (#IDI-015)

Theme 4. Collaborative and Purpose-Driven Leadership

Participants described effective leadership as involving teamwork, shared responsibility, transparency, and alignment of individual work with institutional goals. They emphasized discussing problems collectively, explaining the reasons behind decisions, and maintaining a common organizational purpose. Participants expressed:

"If there is a problem in the office, we discuss it together... sometimes the staff have solutions that I have not considered." (#IDI-008)

"I explain to them why we are doing something... not just saying, 'This is the order.' They are more willing to cooperate when they understand the reason." (#IDI-011)

"We may have different tasks, but we have one goal... I always remind them that our work should contribute to the goals of the institution." (#IDI-014)

4. Discussion

4.1 Leadership Practices of Generation Z Office Heads in Academic Settings

The findings show that Generation Z office heads generally practice leadership through collaboration, communication, flexibility, and empowerment. The four themes—Collaborative-Participative Leadership, Communication-Centered Leadership, Structured yet Flexible Management, and Empowerment and Trust-

Building—indicate that participants tend to exercise leadership through relational engagement rather than relying exclusively on formal authority. This pattern is consistent with contemporary understandings of leadership in which employee participation, communication, and relationship-building contribute to organizational effectiveness (Frew et al., 2021; Sonmez Cakir & Adiguzel, 2020).

The prominence of Collaborative–Participative Leadership suggests that participants regard employee involvement as an important mechanism for gaining ownership and cooperation. This finding is consistent with Dwidienawati et al. (2022), who reported that younger leaders tend to value collaborative environments and employee participation. Mannheim’s Generational Theory (1952) provides a useful contextual explanation because individuals who develop within particular historical and social conditions may acquire orientations that distinguish their experiences from those of other cohorts (Seamon, 2022). However, the present findings do not support the claim that participative leadership is exclusive to Generation Z. Rather, participants’ accounts suggest that collaboration was frequently their preferred starting point when addressing organizational concerns. This distinction is important because generational cohort membership may influence orientations without determining individual leadership behavior.

The finding on Communication-Centered Leadership further demonstrates the importance participants place on transparency, explanation, and listening. Their practice of explaining the reasons behind policies and changes appeared particularly important when employees initially expressed hesitation. This finding is consistent with Sonmez Cakir and Adiguzel (2020), who emphasized the contribution of effective communication to workplace engagement and organizational effectiveness, and with Frew et al. (2021), who highlighted communication as an important component of effective organizational functioning. From a relational perspective, LMX Theory emphasizes the quality of communication and interaction between leaders and members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), while Social Exchange Theory explains how perceptions of fairness, reciprocity, and support may encourage cooperative responses (Homans, 1958). Thus, communication in the present study appears to function not only as information exchange but also as a means of developing trust and securing cooperation.

Structured yet Flexible Management indicates that participants do not view institutional structure and adaptability as mutually exclusive. They maintained policies and compliance requirements while making situational adjustments when circumstances warranted. This finding is consistent with Transformational Leadership Theory, particularly its emphasis on intellectual stimulation and responsiveness to organizational challenges (Bass, 1985). It also corresponds with Taj’s (2023) discussion of Generation Z’s adaptability within rapidly changing technological and social environments. Nevertheless, the present findings provide a more cautious

interpretation: participants did not simply reject established systems in favor of innovation. Instead, they attempted to balance institutional requirements with practical responsiveness. This suggests that their leadership orientation is better characterized as adaptive within organizational boundaries rather than inherently disruptive or change-oriented.

The theme of Empowerment and Trust-Building further demonstrates the relational nature of participants' leadership. Delegation, guidance, encouragement, and acceptance of employee ideas helped build confidence and ownership among staff. Frangieh et al. (2024) similarly emphasized support, mentoring, and empowerment as important dimensions of contemporary leadership. The finding is also consistent with Transformational Leadership Theory, particularly individualized consideration, which emphasizes attention to followers' development and individual needs (Bass, 1985). LMX Theory likewise provides a useful relational interpretation because trust, mutual respect, and supportive leader-member relationships are central to effective exchanges between leaders and employees (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Taken together, these findings indicate that participants favor a leadership orientation characterized by participation, transparent communication, adaptive management, and employee empowerment. Importantly, however, these practices should not be treated as inherently or exclusively generational. Leadership research and leaders across age groups have documented similar practices. The present findings add evidence that participants frequently described these approaches as their preferred or instinctive way of leading. This distinction supports Mannheim's (1952) framework without reducing leadership behavior to generational membership alone.

3.2 Challenges Encountered by Generation Z Office Heads in Academic Settings

The findings further show that participants implement their preferred leadership practices within complex institutional environments. The themes of Generational and Authority Gap, Resistance to Change and Innovation, Team Diversity and Dynamics, and Workload Complexity and Institutional Pressure reveal that Generation Z office heads must negotiate between their preferred leadership approaches and established organizational expectations.

The Generational and Authority Gap represents one of the most significant challenges. Participants described situations in which senior personnel preferred centralized decision-making and were initially hesitant to participate in collaborative processes. Mannheim's Generational Theory (1952) provides a useful contextual lens because individuals from different generations may develop orientations influenced by different historical and social conditions (Seamon, 2022). However, this finding should not be interpreted as evidence that older employees are inherently resistant to

participative leadership. Differences in organizational tenure, professional experience, institutional culture, and expectations of authority may also shape these interactions. Goel and Singla (2025) similarly reported challenges that younger leaders may experience in establishing credibility and acceptance among more experienced employees.

The finding also reinforces the relevance of LMX Theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Formal appointment to a leadership position does not necessarily guarantee relational acceptance. Younger office heads may therefore need to establish credibility through communication, competence, consistency, and trust. The tension between participants' collaborative orientation and some employees' preference for directive leadership suggests that leadership legitimacy is negotiated through relationships rather than derived solely from organizational position.

Resistance to Change and Innovation represents another recurring challenge. Participants encountered employees accustomed to established systems who were hesitant to adopt unfamiliar procedures. Kurter (2025) similarly emphasized that deeply established organizational practices and cultures can create barriers to innovation and modernization. Social Exchange Theory (Homans, 1958) offers another useful explanation because organizational members may assess changes based on their perceived benefits, costs, risks, and implications for their established routines. From this perspective, resistance does not necessarily indicate opposition to the leader personally; it may reflect uncertainty regarding what organizational change will require from employees.

The findings also provide an important qualification to Transformational Leadership Theory. Although transformational leadership emphasizes vision, motivation, and intellectual stimulation to encourage change (Bass, 1985), the participants' experiences suggest that communicating a vision alone may not be sufficient. Change also requires explanation, consultation, gradual implementation, and practical support. Thus, successful change leadership appears to involve both inspiring change and managing the transition required to implement it.

The challenge of Team Diversity and Dynamics demonstrates that participants must accommodate differences in motivation, participation, communication, and work preferences. Van Knippenberg et al. (2020) emphasized that workforce diversity can contribute to organizational effectiveness when differences are appropriately managed. The present findings similarly indicate that diversity requires leaders to recognize individual needs while maintaining fairness and collective cohesion. LMX Theory is particularly relevant because it focuses on the quality of individual leader-member relationships (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Transformational Leadership Theory also provides support through its emphasis on individualized consideration (Bass, 1985). The participants' experiences suggest that effective leadership therefore

requires the ability to adjust interpersonal approaches without compromising consistency in organizational expectations.

Workload Complexity and Institutional Pressure extends the discussion beyond interpersonal leadership. Participants described simultaneously managing personnel, reports, compliance requirements, meetings, institutional programs, and regular office responsibilities. Cagaanan and Gosadan (2020) similarly identified the demanding nature of leadership responsibilities and their implications for leaders' well-being and professional development. Frew et al. (2021) further emphasized the importance of effective organizational systems and administrative processes in supporting institutional effectiveness.

The present finding suggests that leadership effectiveness cannot be understood solely through interpersonal style. Generation Z office heads must also perform substantial operational and administrative functions. Their leadership therefore requires strategic prioritization, delegation, time management, coordination, and compliance management. This finding matters for leadership development because emerging leaders may need preparation not only in relational and transformational competencies but also in the practical demands of higher education administration.

Taken together, the challenges reveal an important tension in the findings. Participants preferred collaboration, empowerment, and adaptability, yet they sometimes encountered organizational expectations favoring hierarchy, established procedures, and centralized authority. This tension suggests that Generation Z office heads are not simply replacing traditional leadership approaches with new ones. Rather, they are negotiating between contemporary leadership preferences and established institutional structures. This provides a more nuanced interpretation of Mannheim's (1952) generational perspective because leadership practices emerge through the interaction of generational orientation with organizational context.

3.3 Conceptualization of Effective Leadership among Generation Z Office Heads

Participants' conceptualization of effective leadership synthesizes the leadership practices and challenges they experienced. The four themes—Adaptive and Innovative Leadership, Inclusive and Empathetic Leadership, Technology-Driven Leadership, and Collaborative and Purpose-Driven Leadership—suggest that participants define effective leadership through responsiveness, human-centered relationships, digital competence, collaboration, and commitment to institutional objectives.

The emphasis on Adaptive and Innovative Leadership indicates that participants associate leadership effectiveness with the capacity to respond to changing circumstances and improve existing practices. Taj (2023) identified adaptability as an important characteristic associated with Generation Z, particularly given the cohort's

exposure to rapid technological and social change. Osumo et al. (2025) likewise identified contemporary competencies associated with emerging Generation Z leadership. Mannheim's Generational Theory (1952) offers a broader contextual explanation by suggesting that formative social conditions may influence the orientations individuals develop. However, the present findings do not establish that adaptability results automatically from generational membership. Rather, participants demonstrated adaptability through concrete practices such as modifying procedures, adopting new systems, and considering alternative approaches.

Transformational Leadership Theory provides a complementary explanation, particularly through intellectual stimulation, which encourages leaders and followers to reconsider existing practices and pursue innovative solutions (Bass, 1985). The participants' understanding of effective leadership therefore reflects an orientation toward continuous improvement rather than strict adherence to established procedures.

Inclusive and Empathetic Leadership was also central to participants' understanding of effectiveness. Participants described fairness, listening, respect, and concern for employees' circumstances as essential components of good leadership. Magano et al. (2020) and Bulut and Maraba (2021) emphasized the importance of emotional intelligence and interpersonal competence in contemporary professional and leadership contexts. The present findings similarly suggest that participants view interpersonal sensitivity as an important leadership capability.

This finding aligns closely with Transformational Leadership Theory's concept of individualized consideration, which emphasizes attention to individual employees and their development (Bass, 1985). It also corresponds with LMX Theory, which emphasizes trust and relationship quality between leaders and individual members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The importance participants placed on empathy is particularly meaningful given the challenges they encountered in managing generational differences and diverse employee needs. Empathy appears to provide a relational mechanism through which leaders can understand differences while maintaining organizational expectations.

The theme of Technology-Driven Leadership demonstrates that participants perceive digital competence as an increasingly important dimension of effective leadership. Taj (2023), Sinha (2024), and Kapoor (2024) similarly emphasized the strong digital orientation associated with Generation Z and the growing importance of technological competence in contemporary organizational environments. Osumo et al. (2025) further support the relevance of contemporary competencies among Generation Z professionals.

This study extends the discussion by showing how participants connect technology to concrete leadership functions, including communication, administrative efficiency, monitoring, coordination, and service delivery. Technology was therefore not simply viewed as a generational characteristic but as a practical resource for

improving organizational processes. In higher education, where administrative operations increasingly depend on digital platforms, this capability may be particularly relevant to emerging leadership roles.

Finally, Collaborative and Purpose-Driven Leadership indicates that participants associate effective leadership with teamwork, transparency, shared responsibility, and alignment with institutional objectives. Kraght and Brøndum (2025) and Venida (2022) similarly reported Generation Z preferences for collaborative environments and greater participation in organizational processes. These findings reinforce the importance of shared purpose and employee involvement in contemporary leadership.

Transformational Leadership Theory offers a strong explanation through inspirational motivation, which emphasizes communicating shared goals and encouraging collective commitment (Bass, 1985). Social Exchange Theory (Homans, 1958) also offers a relational perspective, as cooperation and commitment may strengthen when employees perceive mutual support and reciprocity. LMX Theory further highlights the importance of productive relationships between leaders and individual members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

However, the participants' perceived connection between collaborative leadership and organizational effectiveness should be interpreted cautiously. The present qualitative study did not independently measure organizational performance and therefore cannot establish that Generation Z leadership causes improved institutional outcomes. What can be established is that participants themselves associate collaboration, shared responsibility, and transparent leadership with effective organizational functioning.

Overall, the findings suggest that Generation Z office heads conceptualize effective leadership as adaptive, inclusive, technologically capable, collaborative, and purpose-driven. These characteristics correspond with the theoretical perspectives guiding the study while also revealing the contextual realities of Philippine higher education. Mannheim's Generational Theory helps explain the possible influence of shared historical and social experiences without reducing leadership to generational membership. Transformational Leadership Theory helps explain participants' emphasis on innovation, motivation, employee development, and shared purpose. Relational concepts from Social Exchange Theory and LMX Theory further illuminate the importance of reciprocity, trust, communication, and leader-member relationships.

More importantly, the findings reveal that Generation Z office heads' leadership is characterized not simply by a preference for new leadership practices but by negotiating those practices within existing institutional structures. Participants valued collaboration while facing hierarchical expectations, promoted innovation while managing resistance to change, emphasized empathy while meeting institutional requirements, and used technology while carrying substantial administrative

workloads. This tension contributes to understanding Generation Z leadership in Philippine higher education. It suggests that developing effective emerging leaders requires more than promoting generationally associated characteristics; it requires institutional support that enables young leaders to translate collaboration, innovation, empathy, and digital competence into sustainable leadership practices while navigating organizational traditions, authority structures, and administrative demands.

5. Conclusion

The findings indicate that Generation Z leaders in higher education institutions in North Cotabato primarily practice collaborative decision-making, open communication, adaptability, and employee empowerment as core leadership approaches. Rather than relying on traditional hierarchical authority, they promote shared responsibility, transparency, trust, and active stakeholder engagement. Participants perceived these practices as contributing to stronger workplace relationships, engagement, and organizational effectiveness. To build on these perceived strengths, higher education institutions should provide leadership development programs that enhance participatory governance, communication management, conflict resolution, and team collaboration skills among emerging leaders. Institutional policies should also create opportunities for young leaders to participate in strategic planning and decision-making processes to strengthen participatory leadership and employee engagement. These are participants' own perceptions of their leadership and its reception, not independently verified organizational outcomes; understanding how instructors, staff, or other organizational members experience these leaders' practices would require separate data collection from those groups.

Despite their innovative and people-centered leadership orientation, Generation Z office heads face challenges related to authority gaps, resistance to change, workforce diversity, and increasing administrative demands. These challenges highlight the need for targeted interventions that strengthen leadership credibility, stakeholder management, change leadership, and strategic decision-making capabilities. Higher education institutions in North Cotabato should implement structured mentoring programs that connect Generation Z leaders with experienced administrators, provide professional development in organizational change management, and establish support mechanisms that help leaders navigate intergenerational workplace dynamics while maintaining institutional accountability. Furthermore, participants conceptualized effective leadership as integrating innovation, empathy, digital competence, collaboration, and a shared organizational vision. This perspective reflects the participants' understanding of leadership as increasingly technology-informed, relational, inclusive, and purpose-driven within

contemporary higher education settings. Consequently, higher education institutions should consider investing in digital leadership training, inclusive management practices, and collaborative platforms that support communication, innovation, and stakeholder participation. Such institutional support may help Generation Z leaders navigate evolving educational and administrative demands while sustaining collaborative and accountable leadership practices. Taken together, these findings suggest a reconsideration of single-theory accounts of leadership effectiveness in higher education administration: no one framework among Mannheim's Generational Theory, Social Exchange Theory, Transformational Leadership Theory, or LMX Theory fully captured participants' accounts on its own, and the tension identified between participants' preferred collaborative style and its institutional reception suggests that models of educational leadership effectiveness may need to treat generational leadership style and institutional legitimacy as separate, sometimes conflicting, dimensions rather than assuming that a leader's preferred style directly translates into organizational acceptance or effectiveness.

6. Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to exploring the leadership practices of Generation Z office heads in selected Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in North Cotabato using a qualitative descriptive design. The findings are based on the self-reported accounts of fifteen (15) participants, which may be influenced by individual perceptions, personal experiences, recall bias, social-desirability bias, and the participants' willingness to disclose their experiences; because participants were describing their own leadership, the findings may present these practices more favorably than an independent observer or the instructors, staff, or subordinates who experience this leadership firsthand would. This study did not collect data from those organizational members, nor did it collect organizational performance indicators, employee outcomes, or institutional records; consequently, claims regarding organizational effectiveness or success reflect participants' own perceptions and should not be read as independently verified organizational outcomes. Purposive maximum variation sampling and the relatively small sample size may have included participants whose experiences do not fully represent the broader population of Generation Z office heads. Furthermore, the study was conducted within a single geographic region, North Cotabato; therefore, its findings may be shaped by the area's specific institutional, cultural, and organizational conditions and may not be directly transferable to other regions or higher education contexts.

Interpreting the qualitative data also involved the researchers' analytical judgments in identifying, organizing, and constructing meanings from participants'

accounts. Although systematic procedures enhanced the credibility and consistency of the analysis, researcher interpretation remains an inherent consideration in phenomenological inquiry. Where artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted tools supported the organization, sorting, or preliminary management of qualitative data, they served only as supplementary aids and did not replace the researchers' analytical judgment. Nevertheless, AI-assisted organization may have limitations in accurately recognizing contextual nuances, meanings, or culturally situated expressions within participants' narratives. Accordingly, the findings should be understood as contextually grounded interpretations of the participants' lived experiences rather than statistically generalizable conclusions.

Acknowledgment

The authors sincerely thank the Makilala Institute of Science and Technology and Central Mindanao Colleges, Philippines, for their institutional support throughout this study. The authors also express their heartfelt appreciation to the participating Generation Z office heads from higher education institutions in North Cotabato for generously sharing their experiences and insights. Gratitude is likewise extended to the research adviser, faculty members, and colleagues whose valuable guidance, encouragement, and constructive feedback contributed to the successful completion of this research.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this study. The authors have no financial, professional, institutional, or personal relationships that could have influenced the conduct of the research, the interpretation of the findings, or the preparation of this manuscript.

References

- Alrayssi, A. K. (2025). *The moderation and mediation role of employee engagement and dynamic capabilities on leadership decision making and organisational performance in the UAE energy sector* [Doctoral thesis, University of Derby].
https://repository.derby.ac.uk/download/dc21d2f19ddc23732725ebb0797035f145b7136edecb2b80e604d21c701b49db/2722660/Alrayssi_Final%20Thesis_.pdf
- Aquino, J. M. D. R. (2025). Best practices of high-performing higher education institutions in the Philippines towards the development of a harmonized quality-assured instructional leadership framework. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1663289.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1663289>

- Azman, N., Sirat, M., Abdul Rahman, S., Ahmad, Y., & Komoo, I. (2024). Higher education leadership development in selected ASEAN countries: An exploratory study of challenges and prospects in public higher education institutions. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 54(7), 1137–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2023.2179869>
- Batang, B., Villa, F., Natividad, A., Gonzales, A., Cabansag, J., & Bangayan, O. (2025). Culturally informed leadership and management practices in Philippine state universities and colleges: Navigating institutional excellence through localized governance and academic culture. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion*, 7(SI2), 751–770. <https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.243>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press. <https://search.worldcat.org/title/Leadership-and-performance-beyond-expectations/oclc/11371137>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bulut, S., & Maraba, D. (2021). Generation Z and its perception of work through habits, motivations, expectations, preferences, and work ethics. *Psychology and Psychotherapy Research Study*, 4(4), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.31031/PPRS.2020.04.000593>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=895083>
- Cagaanan, J. C. A., & Gosadan, B. D. (2020). Research competency among elementary school teachers: An evaluative assessment for school-based action research (SBAR). *International Social Science Review*, 2(1). <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=15810>
- Christou, P. A. (2023). How to use artificial intelligence (AI) as a resource, methodological and analysis tool in qualitative research? *The Qualitative Report*, 28(7), 1968–1980. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2023.6406>
- Dimokas, M. (2025). *Navigating generational shifts: Motivating Gen Z to enhance engagement and work performance in the business landscape* [Master's thesis]. Theseus. <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:amk-2025051511985>
- Dwidienawati, D., Syahchari, D. H., & Tjahjana, D. (2022). Effective leadership style for Generation Z. In *Proceedings of the 5th European International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*. IEOM Society International. <https://doi.org/10.46254/EU05.20220183>
- Frangieh, J., Jones, T., Kinser, P. A., Baker, K., Elswick, R. K., Jr., & Thacker, L. R. (2024). Leadership behaviors of frontline nurse managers: A mixed-methods research study identifying essential areas for social support. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 54(2), 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNA.0000000000001389>
- Frew, T., Dadi, T., Girma, H., & Teklemichael, Y. (2021). Practice of leadership effectiveness in public sectors organization. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Organization Management*, 10, Article 298. <https://doi.org/10.37421/2169-026X.2021.10.298>

- Goel, R., & Singla, J. (2024). Workplace transformation: Navigating the transition from remote to hybrid work. In H. C. Chandan (Ed.), *Impact of teleworking and remote work on business: Productivity, retention, advancement, and bottom line* (pp. 178–207). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1314-5.ch008>
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)
- Hassan, T. H., Alfahaid, M. M., Alhuqbani, F. M., Hassanin, M. A., Ali, O. M., Uulu, K. N., Cornelia, P. A., & Salem, A. E. (2025). Hierarchical seniority vs. innovation in hospitality and tourism sustainability education: A social exchange theory perspective. *Sustainability*, 17(18), Article 8100. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17188100>
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
- Islam, M. S. (2025). *The influence of digital leadership on employee performance in the hybrid work context of technology-based MNCs* [Master's thesis]. <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fi-20251217121402>
- Kapoor, S. (2024). *Characteristics of Gen Z in the workplace: Insights & strategies*. Workable. <https://resources.workable.com/stories-and-insights/characteristics-of-gen-z-in-the-workplace-insights-and-strategies>
- Klenke, K. (2016). Qualitative interviewing in leadership research. In *Qualitative research in the study of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 123–150). Emerald Group Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/9781785606502>
- Kraght, H., & Brøndum, L. (2025). Bridging the generational divide: Soft skills and value perceptions of Gen Z in the workforce. *Journal of Innovation in Polytechnic Education*, 6(2), 41–70. <https://doi.org/10.69520/jipe.v6i2.209>
- Kurata, Y. B., Ong, A. K. S., Andrada, C. J. C., Manalo, M. N. S., Sunga, E. J. A. U., & Uy, A. R. M. A. (2022). Factors affecting perceived effectiveness of multigenerational management leadership and metacognition among service industry companies. *Sustainability*, 14(21), Article 13841. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142113841>
- Kurter, O. (2025). Strategic design of organizational culture for digital transformation. *Toplum Ekonomi ve Yönetim Dergisi*, 6(3), 524–544. <https://doi.org/10.58702/teyd.1764602>
- LeBlanc, J. (2024). Bridging the gap: Understanding the workplace environment and leadership preferences of Generation Z. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 6(4), 128–136. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jbms.2024.6.4.12>

- Lemana, H. E., II, & Ahmad, C. V. (2024). Perceptions of change management among Filipino leaders in multinational educational institutions: A multiple case study. *Human Behavior, Development and Society*, 25(3), 134–145. <https://doi.org/10.62370/hbds.v25i3.276056>
- Magano, J., Silva, C., Figueiredo, C., Vitória, A., Nogueira, T., & Dinis, M. A. P. (2020). Generation Z: Fitting project management soft skills competencies—A mixed-method approach. *Education Sciences*, 10(7), Article 187. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10070187>
- Mannheim, K. (1952). The problem of generations. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on the sociology of knowledge* (pp. 276–322). Routledge & Kegan Paul.
https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9781136187407_A23814524/preview-9781136187407_A23814524.pdf
- Muzulon, N. Z., Resende, L. M., Leal, G. C. L., & Pontes, J. (2025). Beyond technical skills: Competency framework for engineers in the digital transformation era. *Societies*, 15(8), Article 217. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15080217>
- National Privacy Commission. (2012). Data Privacy Act (2012)-Republic Act No. 10173. <https://openresearch.repository.anu.edu.au/server/api/core/bitstreams/7d00a0c8-c644-4bfd-b7a4-b86b7cb2f4e9/content>
- Osumo, L. G. F., Tabanay, R. C. U., Dula, A. E. B., Bañados, B. L., & Lalaguna, K. J. P. (2025). Strengthening college-based organizations: A developmental study on cultivating the intellectual and emotional growth of neophyte student leaders. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 12(12) <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v12i12.6433>
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 23(4), 334–340. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X\(200008\)23:4%3C334::AID-NUR9%3E3.0.CO;2-G](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4%3C334::AID-NUR9%3E3.0.CO;2-G)
- Seamon, L. (2022). *Generation Z's perception of leadership effectiveness* [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/12551/>
- Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2016). *Generation Z goes to college*. Jossey-Bass.
https://books.google.com/books/about/Generation_Z_Goes_to_College.html?id=xjDvCQAAQBAJ
- Sinha, A. (2024). *Attention Dynamics in Entrepreneurial and Technology Firms* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine). <https://www.proquest.com/openview/1ce63599a5ea5bfa33dfff854cac6818/1?pqorigsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Sonmez Cakir, F., & Adiguzel, Z. (2020). Analysis of leader effectiveness in organization and knowledge sharing behavior on employees and organization. *SAGE Open*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914634>
- Stanley, M. (2023). Qualitative descriptive: A very good place to start. In S. Nayar & M. Stanley (Eds.), *Qualitative research methodologies for occupational science and occupational therapy* (2nd ed., pp. 52–67). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003456216-4>

- Taj, Y. (2023). Generational shifts in leadership values and beliefs—Focusing Generation Z. *International Journal of Scientific Development and Research*, 8(6), 1943–1947. <https://www.ijedr.org/papers/IJEDR2306266.pdf>
- Tan, E., Wanganoo, L., & Mathur, M. (2023). Generation Z, sustainability orientation and higher education implications: An ecopedagogical conceptual framework. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1), 314–323. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.ss2>
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers. <https://www.loc.gov/item/11010339/>
- Van Knippenberg, D., Nishii, L. H., & Dwertmann, D. J. G. (2020). Synergy from diversity: Managing team diversity to enhance performance. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 6(1), 75–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/237946152000600108>
- Venida, A. C. (2022). Exploring Generation Z teachers' work values: Implications to educational leadership and management. *International Journal of Education*, 15(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v15i1.46153>
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.; T. Parsons, Ed.). Free Press. (Original work published 1922). https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Theory_of_Social_and_Economic_Organi.html?id=Hv-7AAAAIAAJ
- Yoshinaga, K. (2023). The conflict between centralization and decentralization of higher education: The case of educational development in Japan. In A. W. Wiseman (Ed.), *Annual review of comparative and international education 2022* (International Perspectives on Education and Society, Vol. 46B, pp. 97–116). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-36792023000046B007>
-

Author Contributions: Tabanay, R.C.; Study conceptualization, interviews, data analysis, interpretation of findings, and initial manuscript preparation. Osumo, L.G.; Literature review, thematic validation, interpretation of findings, manuscript editing, participant recruitment, transcription, data organization, coding, and manuscript review. Palabrica, J.R.; Research supervision and guidance on research design, methodological rigor, data analysis, interpretation of results, and overall study direction. All authors contributed to the critical review and editing of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript and agree to be accountable for the academic integrity and scholarly content of the work.