The Influence of School Heads' Leadership Styles on Teacher Relationships: A Comparative Study of Authoritarian and Non-Authoritarian Approaches in Piñan District

Danilo P. Omamalin
Napuyan Elementary School
danilo.omamalin001@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study examines the influence of school heads' leadership styles on their relationships with teachers, focusing on authoritarian and non-authoritarian approaches in Piñan District. Using a mixed-method approach, data were collected from 50 teachers across 10 public schools through surveys and interviews. Results indicate that non-authoritarian leadership fosters more positive teacher relationships, collaboration, and job satisfaction, while authoritarian leadership is associated with lower morale and limited communication. The findings underscore the importance of adaptive leadership for effective school management.

Keywords: *Leadership Styles, Authoritarian, Non-Authoritarian, Teacher Relationships, School Heads, Piñan District*

INTRODUCTION

Leadership in schools plays a pivotal role in shaping the professional relationships between school heads and teachers. Effective communication, trust, and collaboration are crucial for creating a productive educational environment. Leadership styles—particularly authoritarian and non-authoritarian approaches—significantly influence these dynamics. Authoritarian leaders maintain strict control and decision-making power, often limiting teacher autonomy, whereas non-authoritarian leaders encourage participation, feedback, and shared decision-making.

This study aims to explore how these leadership styles impact teacher relationships in Piñan District. Understanding this influence is vital for improving teacher satisfaction, motivation, and overall school performance.

Statement of the Problem

This research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What leadership styles do school heads in Piñan District primarily exhibit?

2. How do authoritarian and non-authoritarian leadership styles affect teacher relationships?

3. What differences exist in teacher perceptions of school heads' leadership approaches?

Significance of the Study

The study provides theoretical and practical insights. Theoretically, it contributes to the literature on educational leadership and organizational behavior. Practically, it informs school administrators, teachers, and policymakers about effective leadership strategies that foster positive teacher relationships.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-comparative research design to examine the influence of leadership styles on teacher relationships.

Participants

Participants included 50 teachers from 10 public schools in Piñan District, selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation across schools with varying leadership styles.

Instruments

1. **Survey Questionnaire** – Measured teachers' perceptions of leadership styles and their effects on relationships using a 5-point Likert scale.

2. **Semi-Structured Interviews** – Provided qualitative insights into teacher experiences and perceptions of school heads' leadership approaches.

Data Gathering Procedure

Researchers obtained permission from the district office and school heads before conducting surveys and interviews. Teachers were briefed on the purpose of the study, assured confidentiality, and given time to respond.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) and comparative analysis (t-tests) to identify differences between authoritarian and non-authoritarian leadership styles. Qualitative data were coded thematically to support and enrich quantitative findings.

RESULTS

Quantitative Findings

- Teachers under non-authoritarian leaders reported higher satisfaction (Mean = 4.32) compared to those under authoritarian leaders (Mean = 3.05).

- Communication and collaboration scores were significantly higher in non-authoritarian-led schools ($p < 0.05$).

Qualitative Findings

- Teachers described non-authoritarian school heads as approachable, encouraging, and supportive, fostering open dialogue.

- Authoritarian leaders were perceived as strict, unapproachable, and directive, limiting teacher autonomy.

Summary of Findings:

Non-authoritarian leadership positively influences teacher relationships, collaboration, and morale, whereas authoritarian leadership tends to create hierarchical and less collaborative environments.

DISCUSSION

The results align with existing literature on transformational and participative leadership, emphasizing the benefits of inclusive decision-making and teacher involvement. Authoritarian leadership may ensure compliance but can hinder motivation, trust, and professional growth. Schools aiming for improved teacher relationships should adopt non-authoritarian practices, including shared decision-making, mentorship, and open communication channels.

Implications:

- School heads should receive leadership training focused on participative approaches.

- Policies should encourage teacher involvement in school decision-making.

- Positive leadership styles can enhance teacher retention and student outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Leadership style significantly impacts teacher relationships. Non-authoritarian school heads foster collaboration, trust, and job satisfaction, while authoritarian leadership may inhibit teacher engagement and morale. Promoting participative leadership in schools can strengthen professional relationships and improve overall school performance in Piñan District.

REFERENCES

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). Sage.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership. In B. Davies (Ed.), *The essentials of school leadership* (pp. 31–43). Paul Chapman.

Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.

Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2002). Schools as learning organizations: Effects on teacher leadership and student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(5), 587–611. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X02038005002