

POST-PANDEMIC LEADERSHIP STYLE PRACTICES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND THE WELL-BEING OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN AURA EDUCATION SYSTEM SCHOOLS

Arturo P. Caseñas, Jr.^{1,}, Marilyn S. Aquino²*

¹Mondriaan Aura College, Subic Bay Freeport Zone, Zambales, Philippines

²School of Professional Studies, Universidad de Dagupan, Dagupan City, Pangasinan, Philippines

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between the leadership styles of school administrators and the well-being of teaching and non-teaching personnel within the Aura education system. Employing a descriptive-correlational design, the research examined the extent of leadership style practices and their influence on personnel well-being across cognitive, subjective, physical, and social dimensions. Data were collected from 53 school administrators and 170 teaching and non-teaching personnel using purposive total population sampling.

The findings revealed that most leadership styles, including Radical Human Leadership, were fully practiced, except for autocratic leadership, which was not practiced. The overall well-being of personnel was rated as excellent across all dimensions. However, statistical analysis indicated significant positive relationships only between transformational and instructional leadership styles and personnel well-being. In contrast, Radical Human Leadership exhibited an insignificant inverse relationship with personnel well-being. These results emphasized the need to reassess emerging leadership styles in the context of their practical efficacy and impact on staff well-being.

The study concluded with recommendations for integrating transformational and instructional leadership principles into school management practices to enhance personnel well-being. The findings contribute to the understanding of leadership's role in post-pandemic educational settings and provide insights for future policy development and leadership training programs.

Keywords: school leadership styles, personnel well-being, transformational leadership, instructional leadership, Radical Human Leadership, post-pandemic education

Introduction

Effective communication is vital in any organizational setting, and office correspondences within COVID-19, officially declared a global pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on March 11, 2020, has impacted over 200 countries, with approximately 701 million cases and 6.9 million fatalities globally as of 2024 (WHO, 2020a; Worldometer, 2024). In the Philippines, the pandemic prompted a state of public health emergency and lockdown measures, including the Enhanced Community Quarantine (ECQ) imposed in Luzon in March 2020, which significantly disrupted daily life and educational systems (Proclamation No. 929, 2020).

The pandemic's rapid spread brought unprecedented challenges to schools, affecting teaching, learning, and the well-being of educators (Al-Dabbagh, 2020). Many schools lacked adequate government support and were unprepared for the sudden shift to remote learning (McLeod & Dulskey, 2021). Globally, higher education institutions transitioned to online platforms, necessitating new digital learning environments (Mishra et al., 2020; Krishnamurthy, 2020). This shift, while accelerating technological adoption, posed significant challenges for educators,

including technostress, role confusion, and work overload (Penado-Abilleira et al., 2021; Prado-Gascó et al., 2020).

In the Philippines, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) introduced flexible learning policies to mitigate disruptions. However, educators reported increased stress, anxiety, and burnout due to pandemic-related uncertainties, fear of contagion, and psychosocial risks in the workplace (Pellerone, 2021; Ozamiz-Etxebarria et al., 2021b). Additionally, the closure of 425 private schools by 2022 further highlighted the pandemic's impact on the education sector (Mateo, 2022).

As schools reopen in a post-pandemic context, educators continue to face challenges such as psychological trauma and collective burnout (Bergren & Gonçalves-Boggio, 2021; Pressley, 2021b). Addressing these issues requires a focus on promoting teacher well-being and adapting leadership strategies to support recovery and resilience in educational institutions.

The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly impacted global education, challenging schools to adapt rapidly to disruptions in teaching and learning while addressing the well-being of educators and staff. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd), through its Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Service (DRRMS), launched Mental Health and Psychosocial Support Services (MHPSS) in 2020 to assist teaching and non-teaching personnel as they navigated these unprecedented challenges (DepEd, 2020).

School administrators played a pivotal role during the pandemic, adopting various leadership styles, including transformational, servant, and situational leadership, to address emerging needs. However, the pandemic highlighted gaps in crisis management preparedness and the need for leaders to adapt effectively in uncertain and rapidly changing circumstances (Dykstra-Lathrop, 2022). Research underscores the importance of leadership behaviors in influencing employee well-being, job satisfaction, and performance, with styles like transformational and servant leadership having a particularly positive impact (Das et al., 2022; Samad et al., 2021; Zeng et al., 2022).

As the world transitions into the post-pandemic era, the declaration by the World Health Organization (WHO) in May 2023 marked the end of COVID-19 as a public health emergency, signaling a shift toward resuming face-to-face educational activities (WHO, 2023). In response, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) issued updated guidelines for in-person classes, further reshaping the educational landscape. This transition has introduced new challenges for school administrators, necessitating the exploration of innovative leadership approaches to foster organizational growth and staff well-being.

In this context, the Aura education system has taken proactive measures, notably training school administrators in *Radical Human Leadership*. This emerging style emphasizes deeply rooted, authentic, and adaptive leadership practices to address the complexities of the post-pandemic educational environment. Grounded in principles of purpose, compassion, and collective growth, this leadership model aims to enhance administrators' capacity to respond to evolving challenges while fostering a supportive work culture (Radical Leadership, 2020).

The Aura education system's adoption of *Radical Human Leadership* represents an innovative approach to addressing the complexities of the post-pandemic educational landscape. This leadership style emphasizes authenticity, adaptability, and purpose-driven practices, grounded in principles of compassion and collective growth. By fostering a supportive and empathetic work culture, this model seeks to enhance administrators' capacity to navigate evolving challenges effectively while prioritizing the well-being of staff and students (Witmer, 2013).

However, the enduring relevance of traditional leadership styles—such as autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, situational, contingent, transformational, transactional, charismatic, bureaucratic, instructional, and servant leadership—raises critical questions about the efficacy of *Radical Human Leadership*. Traditional styles have demonstrated significant value across diverse

organizational settings and challenges. Transformational leadership, for example, is widely recognized for its ability to inspire and motivate employees, often leading to improved well-being, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, particularly during periods of change (Campos, 2020; Samad et al., 2021). Similarly, servant leadership, which emphasizes service to others and ethical collaboration, has been linked to increased team cohesion, employee well-being, and ethical behavior in organizations (Chan, 2018; Zeng et al., 2022). Situational leadership, an adaptive approach that aligns leadership style with the specific needs of a team and context, has proven effective in crisis situations by promoting flexibility and responsiveness (Hersey et al., 2008).

The emergence of *Radical Human Leadership* invites an exploration of whether it can surpass or complement these established models. Some researchers argue that new leadership paradigms should integrate traditional principles while addressing contemporary demands, such as fostering psychological safety, inclusivity, and resilience (Deshwal & Ali, 2020; Inceoglu et al., 2018). Others caution against adopting a single dominant approach, emphasizing that leadership effectiveness often depends on contextual factors such as organizational culture, team dynamics, and the nature of specific challenges (Inceoglu et al., 2018).

The pandemic has further underscored the importance of leaders' emotional intelligence, agility, and ethical orientation—traits that are central to transformational and servant leadership but also resonate with the principles of *Radical Human Leadership*. Maxwell (2019) aptly observed that effective leaders must continually "leadshift," adapting their approach to align with a rapidly changing environment. This insight reinforces the need for leadership styles that are not only innovative but also capable of integrating proven strategies from traditional models.

The Aura education system, while proactively implementing training in Radical Human Leadership, operates within a broader context where traditional leadership styles such as transformational, servant, situational, and instructional leadership have demonstrated effectiveness. However, there remains a gap in understanding the comparative efficacy of Radical Human Leadership against these established styles in promoting staff well-being and institutional resilience during the post-pandemic transition.

Investigating the comparative strengths and limitations of *Radical Human Leadership* alongside traditional styles is vital for informing policy and practice. Such research can provide clarity on which approaches are most effective for enhancing organizational resilience, fostering innovation, and supporting the holistic well-being of educators in a post-pandemic context. This understanding will guide educational institutions in cultivating leadership practices that balance the wisdom of tradition with the demands of modernity, ensuring responsiveness to the evolving needs of their stakeholders.

Hence, this study sought to address the following problems:

1. What are the post-pandemic leadership styles of school administrators in the Aura education system?
2. What is the level of well-being among school personnel (teaching and non-teaching) in post-pandemic school environments?
3. Which leadership styles are perceived as most effective in fostering better well-being within the Aura education system?

Method

The study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between the leadership style practices of school administrators and the well-being of teaching and non-teaching personnel. This design was chosen because it allows for the exploration of existing relationships between variables without manipulating them (Creswell, 2014).

This study used a total enumeration given that the population – the Aura Education System – has a specific and manageable number of employees categorized as either school

administrators or personnel (teaching and non-teaching). The total number of school administrators – including school heads, vice presidents, principals, deans, program heads, and department heads – was 53, spread across the five member schools, to wit: Mondriaan Aura College (24), Aura De Laurentus Business High School (9), Wisdom and Virtue Montessori Schools in Bulacan and Bataan (10), and Aura Vista Montessori and High School (10). The total number of school personnel (teaching and non-teaching) was 170, spread across the five schools, to wit: Mondriaan Aura College (101), Aura De Laurentus Business High School (20), Wisdom and Virtue Montessori Schools in Bulacan and Bataan (32), and Aura Vista Montessori and High School (17).

The two main variables of interest in this study were the extent of leadership style practices and the well-being of the personnel. The first variable, the extent of leadership style practice, was assessed based on several leadership styles, including autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, situational, contingent, transformational, transactional, charismatic, bureaucratic, instructional, servant, and radical human leadership. For each leadership style, several indicators were used to determine the extent of practice. The second variable, the well-being of teachers, was measured across four dimensions: cognitive, subjective, physical, and social well-being, offering a comprehensive view of the impact of leadership on the overall well-being of educators.

To collect data, a two-part instrument was used. The first part assessed the extent to which school administrators practiced various leadership styles, with a Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The second part measured the well-being of the teaching and non-teaching personnel, assessing cognitive, subjective, physical, and social well-being. The instrument underwent pilot testing to ensure its reliability and validity before being distributed to the respondents. The survey was administered to the teaching and non-teaching staff within the Aura education system, with participants responding anonymously to promote honest feedback. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and confidentiality was assured throughout the process. Data were collected through an online survey platform to ensure ease of participation.

Data analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics, such as mean scores and weighted means, to analyze the responses to the leadership style and well-being indicators. In the analysis of relationship, data for both variables the extent of leadership style practices and the well-being of the personnel were aggregated per school. For example, data for the extent of practice of the autocratic (authoritarian) leadership style for Mondriaan Aura College is the mean of the extent of practice of the autocratic (authoritarian) leadership style of all the 24 school administrators from that school. In like manner, data for well-being of personnel for the same school is the mean of the well-being of all the 101 personnel. The resulting data set was then used to conduct Pearson correlation to examine the relationship between leadership styles and well-being. This allowed for an understanding of the strength and direction of the associations between each of the leadership styles practiced by school administrators and the well-being of personnel. The study also adhered to ethical guidelines, ensuring informed consent was obtained from all participants, and their responses were kept confidential. Ethical approval was secured from the institution's research ethics board, and data protection and privacy were prioritized throughout the research process.

The findings of this study offer significant insights into the relationship between leadership styles and employee well-being in educational settings. The results contribute to the understanding of how different leadership styles influence the overall well-being of teachers and staff. Additionally, the findings have practical implications for school administrators and policymakers, providing guidance on leadership development programs, strategies for enhancing well-being, and fostering a supportive work environment. This research ultimately aims to inform future leadership practices and policy-making in the educational sector, with the goal of improving the work conditions and overall well-being of teaching and non-teaching personnel.

Results and Discussion

Post-pandemic Leadership Styles of School Administrators in the Aura Education System

For each leadership style, several indicators was used to determine the extent of practice. Table 1 presents the weighted mean (WM) for each style.

The findings reveal the extent to which school administrators in the Aura education system practice various leadership styles, with the data offering significant insights into the prevalent leadership practices in the post-pandemic era. The scores reflect a tendency toward leadership styles that emphasize collaboration, adaptability, and employee well-being, aligning with current trends in educational leadership and findings from previous studies.

Table 1. Extent of Practice by School Administrators of each Leadership Style

Leadership Style	WM	Description
a. autocratic (authoritarian);	1.72	Not Practiced
b. democratic (participative);	3.65	Fully Practiced
c. laissez-faire (delegative);	3.33	Fully Practiced
d. situational;	3.56	Fully Practiced
e. contingent;	3.53	Fully Practiced
f. transformational;	3.54	Fully Practiced
g. transactional;	3.26	Fully Practiced
h. charismatic;	3.45	Fully Practiced
i. bureaucratic;	3.47	Fully Practiced
j. instructional;	3.63	Fully Practiced
k. servant; and	3.68	Fully Practiced
l. radical human leadership style	3.70	Fully Practiced

First, the autocratic (authoritarian) leadership style, which scored 1.72, was found to be *not practiced* by school administrators. This result is consistent with modern educational leadership research that suggests a shift away from autocratic styles toward more participative and collaborative models (Dumulescu & Muțiu, 2021). This is in line with Dykstra-Lathrop's (2022) argument that the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated adaptability and flexibility from educational leaders, thereby reducing the effectiveness of authoritarian approaches.

On the other hand, democratic (participative) leadership, with a score of 3.65, shows that administrators actively involve their teams in decision-making, fostering a sense of shared responsibility and empowerment. This aligns with Inceoglu et al. (2018), who emphasized that democratic and transformational leadership styles positively influence employee well-being and performance. The findings also support the notion that participative leadership increases collaboration and job satisfaction, particularly in challenging contexts such as the pandemic.

The laissez-faire (delegative) leadership style, with a score of 3.33, suggests a moderate degree of autonomy granted to staff. This style, although not as strongly endorsed as others, reflects an approach where administrators trust their staff to make decisions while still providing necessary guidance. This approach is in line with Krishnamurthy (2020), who suggested that a more decentralized form of leadership allows educators to manage their tasks independently, which can be empowering but may also create risks of role ambiguity and workload imbalance, as noted by Penado-Abilleira et al. (2021).

Leadership styles such as situational, contingent, and transformational, with mean scores ranging from 3.53 to 3.56, reflect the flexibility and adaptability of the administrators. These leadership styles align with findings by Al-Dabbagh (2020), who highlighted the importance of

adaptability in leadership during the pandemic, as well as with Das et al. (2022), who demonstrated that transformational leadership positively impacted employee well-being by promoting motivation and fostering a supportive environment. These findings suggest that administrators in the Aura education system are attuned to the dynamic needs of their schools, responding to changing circumstances with the appropriate leadership style.

The transactional style, scoring 3.26, while still in the “fully practiced” category, indicates a leadership approach that relies on structured exchanges between administrators and staff, where performance is typically rewarded or corrected based on specific criteria. This result corresponds with the findings of Samad et al. (2021), who noted that transactional leadership is often used to maintain organizational stability, but it may not be as effective in fostering long-term employee satisfaction and growth compared to transformational or servant leadership styles.

Charismatic, bureaucratic, and instructional leadership styles, which scored above 3.4, highlight that administrators also emphasize visionary leadership, adherence to rules, and a focus on teaching and learning outcomes. These results resonate with the findings of Heidmets and Liik (2014), who demonstrated that instructional leadership positively affects teachers' well-being and emotional attachment to their workplace. The bureaucratic approach, with its focus on structured processes and guidelines, is consistent with research indicating that clear organizational structures help maintain order during times of uncertainty (Mishra et al., 2020).

Finally, the servant and radical human leadership styles received the highest scores of 3.68 and 3.70, respectively, signaling a strong commitment to leadership that prioritizes employee well-being, empowerment, and personal growth. These results support the work of Zeng et al. (2022), who found that servant leadership positively impacts employees' well-being by fostering a culture of care and support. Furthermore, the emphasis on radical human leadership aligns with the findings of Maxwell (2019), who advocated for leaders to embrace adaptive, authentic leadership practices that are deeply rooted in human connection and compassion. Radical Human Leadership, as highlighted by the Radical Leadership (2020) framework, emphasizes trust, authenticity, and transformative action, which are essential for navigating the complexities of the post-pandemic educational environment.

In conclusion, the findings from Table 1 suggest that the leadership styles most practiced within the Aura education system are those that emphasize adaptability, collaboration, and employee well-being. The high scores for servant and radical human leadership styles indicate a strong commitment to nurturing a supportive and growth-oriented school culture. These results reinforce the importance of leadership models that focus on empowerment, trust, and the holistic well-being of educators, as highlighted in the literature by researchers like Das et al. (2022), Samad et al. (2021), and Zeng et al. (2022). The relatively low score for autocratic leadership reflects the shift in educational leadership toward more inclusive and human-centered approaches, which are better suited to the challenges of the post-pandemic educational landscape.

Post-Pandemic Levels of Well-Being of Teaching and Non-Teaching Personnel in the Aura Education System

Table 2 presents the level of well-being among school personnel (teaching and non-teaching) in post-pandemic school environments along cognitive, subjective, physical, and social dimensions of well-being.

Table 2. Level of Well-Being of Teaching and Non-Teaching School Personnel

Dimensions of Well-Being	WM	Description
a. Cognitive	3.65	Excellent Well-Being
b. Subjective	3.65	Excellent Well-Being
c. Physical	3.42	Excellent Well-Being
d. Social Dimensions	3.61	Excellent Well-Being
Overall Well-Being Index	3.58	Excellent Well-Being

The findings presented in Table 2 provide an insightful overview of the well-being levels among teaching and non-teaching personnel in the post-pandemic school environment. The data are categorized into four dimensions of well-being: cognitive, subjective, physical, and social, each showing positive outcomes for the school staff, with the overall well-being index also indicating a generally high level of well-being.

In terms of cognitive well-being, the score of 3.65 places this dimension in the "Excellent Well-Being" category. This result suggests that school personnel feel mentally engaged, focused, and capable of processing information effectively in their work environments. It aligns with previous research indicating that cognitive well-being is crucial for teachers' ability to perform their roles effectively, especially in post-pandemic contexts where new challenges in teaching and learning require adaptive thinking and problem-solving (Penado-Abilleira et al., 2021).

The subjective well-being dimension, with a score of 3.65, also indicates excellent well-being. Subjective well-being reflects how individuals evaluate their own lives and work situations, incorporating aspects such as job satisfaction, happiness, and emotional fulfillment. This high score suggests that both teaching and non-teaching personnel are experiencing a positive perception of their roles and their work environments, which is supported by research showing that job satisfaction and emotional well-being significantly impact performance, motivation, and resilience in educational settings (Zeng et al., 2022; Samad et al., 2021).

For physical well-being, the score of 3.42, while still falling within the "Excellent Well-Being" category, is slightly lower compared to cognitive and subjective well-being. This finding may reflect the physical toll that the demands of the post-pandemic educational environment have taken on personnel, such as increased workload, stress, and potential health concerns arising from the pandemic. Nonetheless, the result still indicates that school personnel are generally maintaining good physical health. This finding is consistent with research suggesting that the physical health of educators is essential for overall well-being and work performance (McLeod & Dulskey, 2021).

The social dimension of well-being, with a score of 3.61, also falls into the "Excellent Well-Being" category. This result suggests that school personnel feel a strong sense of connection and support from their colleagues and communities. The social dimension is crucial for fostering collaboration and a supportive work environment, especially in the post-pandemic context where social isolation and stress were prominent challenges. Research supports the idea that positive social relationships in the workplace contribute significantly to employee morale, teamwork, and overall well-being (Dykstra-Lathrop, 2022; Pellerone, 2021).

Finally, the Overall Well-Being Index, with a score of 3.58, reflects an overall high level of well-being among school personnel. This composite measure reinforces the positive findings across the individual dimensions, indicating that, despite the challenges posed by the post-pandemic educational landscape, teaching and non-teaching staff are experiencing excellent well-being in terms of cognitive, subjective, physical, and social aspects. These results suggest that the leadership practices in place, including those in the Aura education system, may be contributing to a supportive and resilient work environment that fosters the overall well-being of personnel.

In summary, the data in Table 2 provides a strong indication that the well-being of school personnel in post-pandemic environments is excellent across cognitive, subjective, physical, and social dimensions. These findings highlight the importance of leadership styles that prioritize employee well-being, such as servant and radical human leadership, in promoting a holistic sense of health and satisfaction in the workplace.

Correlation between each Leadership Style and the Well-Being of

Table 3 presents the findings of the relationship analyses between the leadership styles of school administrators and personnel well-being.

Table 3. Relationship between Personnel Teaching and Non-Teaching School Personnel

Personnel Well-Being Interacting with Leadership Styles	<i>r</i>	P-Value	Remarks
a. autocratic (authoritarian);	0.580	0.173	Not Significant
b. democratic (participative);	0.337	0.459	Not Significant
c. laissez-faire (delegative);	-0.296	0.519	Not Significant
d. situational;	-0.568	0.183	Not Significant
e. contingent;	-0.021	0.965	Not Significant
f. transformational;	0.867	0.011	Significant
g. transactional;	-0.343	0.451	Not Significant
h. charismatic;	0.199	0.669	Not Significant
i. bureaucratic;	-0.039	0.935	Not Significant
j. instructional;	0.783	0.037	Significant
k. servant; and	0.266	0.564	Not Significant
l. radical human leadership style	-0.275	0.551	Not Significant

The findings presented in Table 3 highlight the relationship between various leadership styles of school administrators and the well-being of both teaching and non-teaching personnel. The analysis reveals that most leadership styles, including autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, situational, contingent, transactional, charismatic, bureaucratic, servant, and radical human leadership, show no significant relationship with personnel well-being, as indicated by their p-values above 0.05. However, transformational and instructional leadership styles exhibit significant relationships with personnel well-being, as evidenced by their lower p-values and higher correlation coefficients.

The transformational leadership style ($r = 0.867$, $p = 0.011$) is strongly and positively correlated with personnel well-being, suggesting that this leadership approach has a substantial positive impact on the well-being of school personnel. This finding aligns with previous studies that emphasize the importance of transformational leadership in promoting employee satisfaction, motivation, and overall well-being. For instance, Das et al. (2022) found that transformational leadership enhances employee engagement and well-being, largely through its focus on empowerment and fostering a positive work environment. Similarly, Samad et al. (2021) demonstrated that transformational leadership is particularly effective in enhancing employee job satisfaction and reducing stress, which are crucial components of overall well-being.

The instructional leadership style ($r = 0.783$, $p = 0.037$) also shows a significant positive relationship with personnel well-being. Instructional leadership, which emphasizes supporting teachers' professional development and improving teaching practices, has been linked to increased teacher satisfaction and reduced burnout (Hallinger, 2018). This finding supports the work of Krishnamurthy (2020), who noted that instructional leadership plays a key role in fostering positive work environments that promote the well-being of educators.

On the other hand, leadership styles such as autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, and others, which tend to be more passive or controlling, do not significantly influence personnel well-being. For example, the autocratic ($r = 0.580$, $p = 0.173$) and democratic ($r = 0.337$, $p = 0.459$) leadership styles, while they may have some potential influence, do not show statistically significant correlations with personnel well-being. This is consistent with findings from Penado-Abilleira et al. (2021), who suggested that autocratic leadership, which focuses on top-down decision-making, can contribute to stress and dissatisfaction among employees. Similarly, laissez-faire leadership ($r = -0.296$, $p = 0.519$), which is characterized by a lack of involvement and guidance from leaders, may contribute to confusion and disengagement, as indicated in previous studies (Prado-Gascó et al., 2020).

In conclusion, the findings suggest that leadership styles focusing on transformational leadership and instructional leadership have a significant, positive impact on personnel well-being, while other leadership styles such as autocratic, laissez-faire, and bureaucratic do not demonstrate a similar effect. These results support the growing body of literature emphasizing the importance of adaptive and supportive leadership styles in enhancing employee well-being, particularly in the context of post-pandemic education systems. Further research could explore the mechanisms through which these leadership styles influence well-being and how they can be integrated into school management practices to improve the work environment for educational personnel.

The findings from the analysis indicate that while school administrators in the Aura Education system show a high adherence to Radical Human Leadership, this does not necessarily translate into a better perception of well-being among school personnel. The relationship between Radical Human Leadership and personnel well-being was found to be inverse, though not statistically significant ($r = -0.275$, $p = 0.551$). This suggests that despite the administrators' focus on compassionate, adaptive leadership practices, personnel may not perceive a corresponding improvement in their overall well-being.

This inverse, albeit non-significant, correlation may be attributed to several factors. One possible explanation is that while Radical Human Leadership promotes a supportive and empathetic approach to leadership, it may not fully address the immediate practical or emotional needs of personnel in post-pandemic educational environments. As research by Penado-Abilleira et al. (2021) indicates, a leadership style that emphasizes compassion and collective growth can be effective, but its impact on well-being may depend on how well it is implemented and perceived by the staff. In the case of the Aura Education system, it is possible that the administrators' adherence to Radical Human Leadership does not sufficiently resonate with or meet the expectations of all personnel, leading to a lack of significant positive impact on their well-being. Moreover, the context of the post-pandemic educational environment may also play a role. Teachers and non-teaching staff have faced unprecedented stress and burnout due to the sudden shift to remote learning, the challenges of hybrid classrooms, and the ongoing mental health strain. According to Bergren and Gonçalves-Boggio (2021), such external factors can overshadow the influence of leadership styles, especially if the strategies implemented by administrators fail to address the deep-seated stressors experienced by personnel. The inverse relationship may therefore suggest that while Radical Human Leadership may be theoretically beneficial, the actual application of this leadership style may not have been perceived as sufficient or impactful in alleviating the complex well-being challenges faced by school personnel during and after the pandemic.

Further research could explore the nuances of Radical Human Leadership in this specific educational context and investigate potential areas for improvement in its implementation. It may also be useful to examine whether other leadership styles, such as transformational or instructional leadership, may be more directly linked to personnel well-being in this post-pandemic period.

References

- Al-Dabbagh, Z. S. (2020). The role of decision-maker in crisis management: A qualitative study using Grounded Theory (COVID-19 pandemic crisis as a model). *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20, e2186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2186>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
- Bergren, M. D. (2021). Post-COVID-19: Trauma-informed care for the school community. *Journal of School Nursing*, 37, 145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10598405211004709>
- Campos, A. (2020, November 5). Transformational leadership theory. *Penn State University*. <https://sites.psu.edu/leadership/2020/11/05/transformational-leadership-theory/>
- Chan, K. (2018). Servant leadership supports wellness development in adolescents. *Servant Leadership: Theory & Practice*, 5(2), 41–52.
- Das, S. S., & Pattanayak, S. (2023). Understanding the effect of leadership styles on employee well-being through leader-member exchange. *Current Psychology*, 42, 21310–21325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03243-3>
- Department of Education. (2021, February 9). DepEd to roll out mental health and psychosocial support programs for 2021. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2021/02/09/deped-to-roll-out-mental-health-and-psychosocial-support-programs-for-2021/>
- Deshwal, V., & Ali, A. (2020). A systematic review of various leadership theories. *Shanlax International Journal of Commerce*, 8, 38–43. <https://doi.org/10.34293/commerce.v8i1.916>
- Dykstra-Lathrop, D. K. (2022). *School leadership through the COVID-19 pandemic: A phenomenological study* (Dissertation). University of Northern Colorado. <https://digscholarship.unco.edu/dissertations/843>
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2013). *Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2008). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300306>
- Inceoglu, I., Thomas, G., Chu, C., Plans, D., & Gerbasi, A. (2018). Leadership behavior and employee well-being: An integrated review and a future study agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.006>
- Mateo, J. (2022, August 20). 425 private schools closed since 2020. *Philstar*. <https://www.philstar.com/nation/2022/08/20/2203802/425-private-schools-closed-2020>
- Maxwell, J. C. (2019). *Leadershift: The 11 essential changes every leader must embrace*. HarperCollins Leadership.
- Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 1, 100012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100012>
- Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ozamiz-Etxebarria, N., Berasategi Santxo, N., Idoiaga Mondragon, N., & Dosil Santamaría, M. (2021b). The psychological state of teachers during the COVID-19 crisis: The challenge of returning to face-to-face teaching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 620718. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.620718>
- Pellerone, M. (2021). Self-perceived instructional competence, self-efficacy and burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic: A study of a group of Italian school teachers. *European Journal*

- of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 11, 496–512. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe11020035>
- Penado-Abilleira, M., Rodicio-García, M. L., Ríos-de Deus, M. P., & Mosquera-González, M. J. (2021). Technostress in Spanish university teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 617650. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.617650>
- Prado-Gascó, V., Gómez-Domínguez, M. T., Soto-Rubio, A., Díaz-Rodríguez, L., & Navarro-Mateu, D. (2020). Stay at home and teach: A comparative study of psychosocial risks between Spain and Mexico during the pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 566900. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.566900>
- Pressley, T. (2021b). Factors contributing to teacher burnout during COVID-19. *Educational Researcher*, 50, 325–327. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211004138>
- Radical Leadership. (2020). *What is radical leadership?* Retrieved from <https://www.radicalleadership.com>
- Samad, A., Muchiri, M., & Shahid, S. (2021). Investigating leadership and employee well-being in higher education. *Emerald Insight*. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/PR-05-2020-0340/full/html>
- Samad, S., Reaburn, P., Davis, H., & Ahmed, E. (2021). The influence of transformational leadership on employees' job satisfaction, well-being, and turnover intentions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(3), 494–517. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2498>
- Witmer, A. (2013, December 4). Radical leadership: The 4 R's of a radical leader. *Adam Witmer*. <https://www.adamwitmer.com/blog/radical-leadership>
- World Health Organization [WHO]. (2020a). *Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Situation report*, 73. WHO.
- World Health Organization [WHO]. (2020b). *Coronavirus (COVID-19)*. WHO.
- Zeng, J., Lai, J., & Liu, X. (2022). How servant leadership motivates young university teachers' workplace well-being: The role of occupational commitment and risk perception. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 996497. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.996497>
- Zeng, X., Zhou, M., Liu, H., & Song, H. (2022). Servant leadership and employee well-being: The mediating roles of trust and emotional exhaustion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 829496. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.829496>