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Abstract

Modern education in Bhutan was introduced as early as 1914, it has come across numerous reforms and development since then. The Royal Government of Bhutan has always placed a top priority on its advancements and rethinking as it grows. Quality of education is one major concern and opportunity in the country in the education sector. Second being the quality of the teachers and educators. Considering the national concern and importance bestowed upon the educators and teachers’ professionalism in particular, the study to explore the leadership styles of the principals has been undertaken. The study is an explorative assessment using the mix method approach using Rensis Likert’s Leadership Styles model. A sample size of 289 respondent teachers from among 19 schools has been collected using 21 item four-point likert-type semi-structured randomly distributed questionnaires and one to one interview questions. The data were analyzed using a statistical package for social sciences version 21 to derive descriptive and inferential statistics. The most popular type of leadership styles perceived to be in practice in the study sample is consultative leadership (75.8 percent), which is followed by benevolent authoritative leadership (14.5 percent) and participative group leadership (9.7 percent). The content analysis of the interview also revealed that the principals were very supportive and engaging and in full support of their subordinates. The study therefore, hopes to create new insights for the policy makers and education sector of the country for rethinking and development as recommended in the study.
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**Context**

Until the 1950s, the education system in Bhutan was mainly monastic. Literacy was confined to the monasteries, and many eminent Bhutanese scholars traveled to Tibet to study Buddhist scriptures. The only formal education available to Bhutanese students, with the exception of a few private schools in Haa and Bumthang established in 1913-1914, was through Buddhist monasteries.

Today, the country has seen the drastic expansion of educational institutes from about 11 schools prior to the first Five Year Plan in 1961 to 1928 schools, institutes & centers (National Statistics Bureau, 2020) in 2020. Considering some changes already witnessed, today, there are numerous changes taking place in the educational systems along with other developmental activities. For instance, the country had witnessed a huge transition in school leadership. The old styles of leadership as administrators and managers had been transformed into instructional leadership since 2010 (MoE, 2010). The other huge change observed was the launch of the GNH in the schools across the country as a mandate to infuse GNH related values and principles at school as miniature of society and in the whole society at large (Utha, et al., 2016).

In this line of thought, efforts to understanding and working on leadership managers (principals in this case) picked up as a global agenda (Aderounmu & Aina, 2008; Simkins, 2005). The Annual Education Statistics (2020) indicated that there were some principals in Bhutan, who had been merely selected from the interview and were assigned with the tasks of school management without availing leadership and school management training. The existence of such a scenario in Bhutan matches very well with the perception of Bramson (2004), who stressed that some leaders secured such positions either due to their long service or attractive curriculum vitae or having just excelled in the interview. Such situations among the schools in Bhutan have indeed posed threats and challenges to many school principals toward school management. On the other hand, there is not much research carried out on the leadership styles of the principals.

The study is expected to have a significant impact on the National Education Policy Reforms which has been initiated upon the Royal Kasho (Royal Decree) during the 113th National Day Address in Punakha Dzong on 17th December 2020. In addition, this study is expected to be well timed and appropriate to add on to the prevailing literature. As a matter of fact, help the Government and relevant stakeholders deliberate on opportunities and concerns of the education system in the country.

The study therefore, focused on teachers’ perceptions towards leadership styles of principals in Thimphu Thromde, Bhutan. The targeted population was 289 teachers from higher to primary schools in Thimphu Thromde, Bhutan.
Research Objective

1. To study the leadership styles of the principals as perceived by their teachers in Thimphu Thromde, Bhutan.

Methodology

Research Design
A sample size of 289 was calculated by survey monkey tool out of the total 1152 teachers from 19 schools (HSS-4, MSS-6, LSS-3, PS-6) in Thimphu Thromde. The study is based on a mix method. The data was collected through semi-structured randomly distributed questionnaires.

Research Instrument

The questionnaire was developed from the Likert’s Leadership Styles, in which there are three sections as follows:

Part I: This section collected general background information of teachers such as age, gender, education level and work experience.

Part II: This section consists of a 21 item five-point likert-type scale developed using dimensions of the Likert Leadership Styles (1967), which were slightly modified as per the contextual needs to administer the Leadership Styles of school principals as perceived by their teachers. From the total of 21 items, 15 items were positive and the remaining 6 were negative. The items as a whole were dissected into six operating characteristics of Likert (1967) as shown in table 1.

Part III: This section consists of 3 item semi-structured interview questions for content analysis.

Table 1. The operating characteristics of principal’s leadership behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indexes</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Total Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation process</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication process</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction influence process</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making process</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting process</td>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling process</td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Songsumpon (2002)
The positive items (1,2,3,4,5,6,7,10,11,12,14,16,18,19,20) were be rated with 4-point Likert scale with the values ranging from 5 indicating 'strongly agree' to 1 indicating 'strongly disagree' while the negative items (8,9,13,15,17,21) were rated as 1 indicating 'strongly agree' to 5 indicating 'strongly disagree'.

**Data Analysis & Statistical Planning**

Data obtained from the questionnaires were processed electronically using the program package in order to find out the descriptive and inferential statistics in the following sequence and the data collected through interview guideline were analyzed using content analysis:

a. The descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentages were used for analyzing personal characteristics of the teachers,

b. The descriptive statistics of frequency and percentages were used to analyze items pertaining to leadership styles of the principals as perceived by teachers.

Further, the scores of the Leadership Behaviors pertaining to Likert’s Leadership Styles were calculated based on the criteria of Best (1970) as demonstrated below:

Highest score - lowest score / no. of levels

=5-1/4

=1

Based on the scores, the leadership behavior was categorized as illustrated in table 2, as per the scores extracted from the above equation.

**Table 2. Procedures for understanding the means of leadership behaviors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Leadership behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00-2.00</td>
<td>Exploitative authoritative leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01-3.00</td>
<td>Benevolent authoritative leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>Consultative leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01-5.00</td>
<td>Participative group leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Songsumpon (2002)
Results

The Personal Characteristics of Teachers

Table 3. Frequency and percentages of personal characteristics of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ demographic factors</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 years and above</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ed</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and above</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of the personal characteristics of teachers using frequency and percentages in table 3 indicated that 55.9 percent of the teacher respondents were male and 44.1 percent were female. Regarding their age, the highest percentage of 41.9 percent
respondents fell into the category of age 31-40 years followed by 39.8 percent of respondents at age group 21-30 years and the least percentage of 18.3 percent respondents were at the age level of 41 years and above. With regard to their education level, the maximum of 54.8 percent of the teachers had Bachelor degree in Education while only 7.5 percent of the teachers had qualification of Master degree in various subjects. The table also indicated that the majority of 60.2 percent of the respondents had work experience of 1-10 years while 14.5 percent of the teachers had work experience of 21 years and above.

The Leadership Styles of Principals as Perceived by Teachers

The statistical report analyzed using frequency and percentages in table 4 provide the clear picture of teachers’ perception toward their principal’s leadership styles. According to which, 75.8 percent of the teachers perceived their principals as consultative leaders followed by 14.5 percent of teachers, who perceived their principals as benevolent authoritative leaders, while 9.7 percent of the teachers perceived their principals as participative group leaders. Furthermore, the result confirmed the non-existent exploitative authoritative leadership style among the secondary school principals as perceived by their teachers.

Table 4. The frequency and percentages of leadership styles of principals as perceived by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Styles</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploitative authoritative leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent authoritative leadership</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative leadership</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative group leadership</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content Analysis of Interview Guidelines

This section provides in-depth information on the leadership styles of the principals. Among 10, 3 principals, (1 female and 2 male) who have served for a period of minimum five years in the same school were chosen as key informants. While asked about their work experience, Principal 1 and 2 reported having more than 20 years of work experience as principals and Principal 3 said to have an experience of 9 years as principal.
They were interviewed in line with the interview guideline. The perceptions drawn from them through interviews were recorded in the notebook as tape-recording was inconvenient due to frequent telephonic interruptions and visits of their subordinates into the principal's office. After the interview session of about 45 minutes for each respondent, the information was transcribed elaborately without any modification to their given opinions.

Finally, the perceptions of an individual principal were analyzed broadly under the heading 1) leadership styles of principals. In the course of the entire analysis, the participants were identified as Principal-1, Principal-2 and Principal-3.

**Question 1: How do you influence your subordinates to accomplish the set goals as a leader?**

The interviewees shared almost similar opinions stating that they normally use the strategies like role model, collaborative decision making, supervision, providing feedback, shared responsibilities to have greater positive influence upon their subordinates. They had further proclaimed that these behaviors in them help them to achieve their set goals and enhance school effectiveness. With regard to role model as power of influence upon subordinates, Principal-3 shared an opinion stating,

“I should be displaying good examples to the subordinates to inject positive behaviors in them”.

Besides applying this strategy of influence, they proclaimed that collaborative decision making at times of job delegation plays a key role towards effective management of schools. They also claimed that sharing of responsibilities among the subordinates eases their administrative burden. Regarding which Principal-1 said,

“I must make sure that the jobs are assigned to everyone through collaborative decision making to ascertain that the right job is given to the right person at the right time. Sharing of responsibilities among the subordinates helps to reduce the workload and ease the managerial work”.

At the same time, they also showed their concern on the significance of timely monitoring and feedback to measure the performance of their subordinates and to promote professional development in their teachers. To ascertain this mode of management of schools, the interviewees claimed that they had appointed various committees and executive bodies to furnish the assigned tasks as scheduled in the school time table. As an evident to this perception, the researcher would like to quote the opinion of Principal-2, who said,

“I have formed various committees and teams at the executive level to prepare strategic plans to be implemented. The implementation of it is always followed by timely monitoring and providing feedback for professional development of teachers and effectiveness of school”.
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Question 2: Does giving reward or punishment to subordinates benefit school management?

Regarding it, they unanimously expressed that reward and punishment certainly has some implications on school management. For instance, Principal-1 shared her thoughts saying,

“Reward and punishment should be given to the right person at the right time so as to bring improvement in a person”.

It was also their general feelings that reward in the form of training opportunities and issuance of letters of recognition to the deserved ones help their administration towards motivating their subordinates and ultimately lead to positive outcomes. Pertaining to it, Principal-3 stated,

“I normally provide training opportunities and issue letters of recognition to hardworking staff with a copy of a letter disseminated to the higher authority and school noticeboard to motivate the concerned person and to sensitize other staff in order to bring them to the path of motivation and increase efficiency”.

However, they also claimed that punishment in the form of verbal warnings, issuance of warning letters or demanding undertaking letters are essential to those undedicated and insincere staff in order to bring improvement in them. Pertaining to it, Principal-3 again strongly proclaimed stating,

“If someone is found insincere and problematic at times of execution of duty, firstly, I like to mentor and remind them about their professional duties. If the improvement is not seen in him or her, then the punishment in the form of verbal and written warnings are given associated with demanding of undertaking letters from an offender. Furthermore, if an offender does not improve then the matter is forwarded to the higher authority. The sole purpose of this kind of action is not to harm one’s career but to help them to improve their work attitude and ultimately to benefit the system”.

On the other hand, the other 2 interviewees declared that although the reward and punishment are key tools to better the system, they need not use this strategy until recently as they found their teachers dedicated towards rendering their duties. Regarding which Principal-2 said,

“Regarding punishment, I have to apply this strategy at times when teachers are found undedicated toward furnishing their duties. However, until then I needn’t use this strategy as my teachers are sincere and self-responsible, complying with their code of conduct set forth by the Royal Civil Service Commission (RCSC)”.
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Question 3: How do you maintain rapport with subordinates to sustain your management?

Regarding this leadership behavior, 1 among 3 respondents contributed quite a unique opinion stating that one should be approachable and helpful to the subordinates at times of needs, yet one must discriminate between good and bad ones. Regarding it, Principal-1 poured out her viewpoint by saying,

“I am very approachable and helpful to subordinates at times of need but at the same time, I am good for good ones and bad for bad ones”.

While the other 2 principals shared similar opinions insisting that collaborative actions would help them towards building stronger relationships with their subordinates and the stakeholders. For instance, the principal-3 stated,

“I keep up relationships with stakeholders, having involved myself with my staff members in the school events like meetings, cultural activities, sports events, some informal gatherings, club activities, etc. Besides, I together with my staff initiate some social gatherings like potlucks, promotion parties and visiting staff members at times of certain household events like religious rituals, birthday party and illness and at times of misfortune”.

These strategies were some of the evidence obtained about their collaborative actions towards building positive rapport among staff members and other stakeholders. Similar to this viewpoint, they also said that the schools initiate a series of social events like formal and informal meetings, sports events, and social gatherings as a forum for interaction and sharing their ideas and aspirations to ensure positive inter-personal relationship with every stakeholder. One of the respondents also opined that freedom of speech is to be highly respected in the democratic world. For instance, Principal-1 strongly exclaimed,

“I respect freedom of speech in this democratic world. These new insights struck my mind only after I underwent leadership training. This is one of the strategies I normally apply to my administration to keep up relationships with my staff members”.

On the other hand, respondent 2 also expressed the similar opinion, who asserted that sharing of opinions and free interaction are primary tools in understanding human problems. Thus, 2 out of 3 respondents unanimously emphasized on the importance of free flow of communication as a key factor in building better rapport within and outside the schools.

As a whole, the remarks of the respondents indicated that their leadership practices were more of both consultative and participative type. From the responses they made, there was a clear indication that they do not practice exploitative authoritative leadership. However, the common consensus of them about using reward and punishment clearly depicted that their leadership practices were characterized by
the leadership behavior of benevolent authoritative leadership because giving reward and punishment is the main characteristics of benevolent leadership.

Discussion
According to the review of literature, the leadership style is termed as a key tool that shapes the whole organization. It is the strategy used by the leaders based on their inner behaviors, experiences and learned wisdom of leadership to have positive influence upon subordinates and mobilize resources towards accomplishing the set goals of the organizations. Simkins (2005) rightly pointed out that either the success or the failure of an organization lies in the leadership. According to Likert (1961), a leadership style is referred to as the “characteristic manner in which a leader exercises power to influence their followers. Organizational leadership represents a linking process among various organizational members at different hierarchical levels”. Likert from his wide range of experience for about 30 years of his research perceived that noble leaders would always heighten their efficacy (Unit of University of Leicester, 1994:59). His wide-ranging research was mostly focused on the managers and employees, school leaders and teachers of various organizations comprising educational institutes. The general findings of his studies revealed four basic styles of management consisting of exploitative authoritative leadership, benevolent authoritative leadership, consultative leadership and participative group leadership.

Among which, this study distinctly confirmed that the consultative leadership style was the predominantly used style of secondary school principals in Thimphu Thromde, Bhutan. The findings of this study is closely linked with the findings of Songsompun (2002), which revealed that the district chief officers of Phattalung province in Thailand were found significantly using consultative leadership styles associated with participative and benevolent authoritative. Regarding other styles, the findings of this study slightly contradict the choices made by the principals for the participative group and the benevolent authoritative leadership styles. For instance, this study discovered benevolent authoritative leadership as the second widely used leadership approach followed by participative group leadership while the previous findings discovered participative leadership as the second choice followed by the benevolent authoritative leadership. However, the non-existent of exploitative authoritative leadership was confirmed by the findings of both the studies.

The result of the content analysis on the leadership styles of principals is also found closely linked with the result of descriptive analysis. From the opinions obtained from the principals, it was assumed that they were popularly using the consultative benevolent and the participative group leadership as indicated by the descriptive report. For instance, during the course of interview session, the few of the dominating characteristics of these leadership styles were revealed by the respondents by sharing their management and leadership styles, which were largely focused on the areas like collaborative decision making, shared responsibilities, team supervision, mentoring and
coaching, communicating school vision and mission statements among the staff, and involvement of their staff in goal setting process.

The principals also shared their concern stating that they are mostly approachable and participative in their leadership approaches. The perceptions shared by them indicated that their leadership approaches bear the characteristics of mixed behaviors of both consultative and participative leadership. For instance, while interviewed, Principal-3 shared an opinion stating,

“I should be displaying good examples to the subordinates to inject positive behaviors in them”.

Similarly, Principal-1 said,

“I must make sure that the jobs are assigned to everyone through collaborative decision making to ascertain that the right jobs are given to the right persons at the right time. At the same time, sharing responsibilities among the subordinates helps to reduce the workload and ease my managerial tasks”.

They also showed their concern on the significance of timely monitoring and feedback to measure the performance of their subordinates and to promote professional development in their teachers. As an evident to this perception, the researcher would like to quote the opinion of Principal-2, who said,

“I have formed various committees and teams at the executive level to prepare strategic plans and to implement them which is followed by timely monitoring and providing feedback for the professional development of teachers and effectiveness of school”.

The perceptions shared by the respondents are supported by the review of literature, which reveals that the consultative leaders are the ones who help to build confidence in subordinates and foster positive relationships and a climate of trust through free communication. However, Owens (1981: 207) pointed out one of the drawbacks of this leadership asserting that the employees under this leadership might secretly oppose the ideas and decisions of their leaders by disobedience although they pretend to be accepting their orders in face-to-face interactions. This situation arises mainly when the manager takes decisions based on the principle of majority. This drawback is caused because there is no horizontal flow of communication under this leadership style like in the participative group leadership. The principals as consultative leaders need to uphold the few of the drawbacks shown in the literature in order to transform themselves into either participative or transformational leadership.

The benevolent leadership, which was used as the second prevalent leadership style by the principals, is further supported by the result of content analysis. While interviewed, the respondents contributed the characteristics of this leadership like giving reward and punishment, which are the basic tools of this leadership to motivate their personnel. For instance, Principal-1 shared her thought by saying,
“Reward and punishment should be given to the right person at the right time so as to bring improvement in a person”.

Similarly, Principal-3 strongly shared his opinion saying,

“If someone is found insincere and problematic at times of execution of duty, firstly, I like to mentor and remind them about their professional duties. If the improvement is not seen in him or her, then the punishment in the form of verbal and writing are given followed by demanding of undertaking letters from an offender. Furthermore, if an offender doesn't improve, the matter is forwarded to the higher authority. The sole purpose of this kind of action is not to harm his or her career but to help him or her to improve work attitude and ultimately to benefit the system”.

Indeed, giving reward and punishment is one of the main characteristics of benevolent authoritative leadership. Further, this style of leadership is associated with other negative traits like leaders making the bulk of decisions and urging their subordinates to make decisions only within the framework. This leadership style is also characterized by fear, caution and pretense as they practice reward and punishment. Hersey and Blanchard (1993:105) discovered a low level of motivation and dissatisfaction among employees under this leadership style.

The result of the descriptive analysis indicating the principals’ participative group leadership as the third choice is further reconfirmed from the interviews. The principals when interviewed shared their opinions about possessing the general attributes of participative group leadership such as the involvement of principals in the school events, collaborative decision-making process and shared responsibilities towards accomplishing the common goals. Indeed, these are some of the core characteristics of this leadership. The literature also predicted the similar attributes regarding this leadership. For instance, it is revealed that this leadership style upholds job autonomy in the employees thus fostering the climate of trust and confidence between the leaders and the employees. The ownership of the organizations is deeply felt in the mind of every employee as there is an involvement of every employee in the process of setting goals, planning, implementation and overall management of the organizations. Under this leadership style, the employees possess comprehensive knowledge about their roles and responsibilities towards goal accomplishment as there is an effective flow of communication. The literature also revealed that this leadership shares the attributes of transformational leadership, which is indeed the current trend of leadership widely practiced in the developed world. Sagor (1992:13) perceived that transformational leaders are successful in translating their vision into reality and lead their schools as exemplary schools since the schools are guided by highly communicated common goals.

Finally, the findings of both the descriptive and content analysis confirmed the non-existent of the exploitative authoritative leadership among the school principals in
Thimphu Thromde. Indeed, this is a positive sign of improvement in their leadership because this leadership style is significantly characterized by negativity. For instance, (Goleman, Boyatzis & Mckee, 2002:77) found that leaders possessing this trait rarely praise their followers rather criticize more thereby letting subordinates lose their confidence towards their leaders and become less committed to their work. The absenteeism of this leadership behavior among the secondary school principals is indeed a positive signal of transforming their leadership into better ones. Perhaps, changing themselves from negative into positive leadership traits is the essential qualities required in the leaders in order to adapt themselves with the paradigm shift in the organizational behaviors in proportion with the other developmental activities.

The findings of this study are further supported with additional information borrowed from the review of literature. For instance, the study conducted by Likert (1967) revealed that the exploitative authoritative and benevolent authoritative leadership approaches were rated with least efficiency than the consultative and participative group leadership approaches. In the overall analysis of the result, Likert found participative leadership approach as the best management style for the effectiveness of the organizations. In addition, findings by Goleman et al. (2002:76-77) indicated that the exploitative authoritative leadership style is marked with ineffective leadership behaviors due to lack of congenial working atmosphere caused by a highly autocratic leadership approach.

From the overall analysis of the principals’ leadership styles, it is conceived that the principals of the research site possess the mixture of both appropriate and inappropriate leadership styles. Conversely, there is an existence of consultative, participative and benevolent leadership. As pointed out in the literature, the consultative and benevolent leadership are characterized by some negative attributes. In contrast, the findings also confirmed the non-existent of exploitative authoritative leadership among the principals. Considering the existing situations, it may be concluded that although the leadership styles of the principals are found at the verge of improvement, there is still a need for the relevant agencies and authorities to focus on this area and provide necessary support to further enhance their leadership to empower the principals with the desirable leadership approaches for the benefit of the entire education system.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study used 2 sets of questionnaires to measure the leadership styles of principals from the perception of a sum of 289 teachers from a total population of 1152 teachers. Regarding their response, 100 percent of the respondents returned the completed questionnaires thus adding standard validity to the findings. The study also employed 3 principles as key informants to share their opinions in line with interview guidelines in order to confirm teachers’ perceptions. From the total sample of 289 teachers, the descriptive analysis of the data indicated that 55.9 percent of the teacher respondents
were male and 44.1 percent were female. Regarding their age, the highest percentage of 41.9 percent respondents fell into the category of age 31-40 years followed by 39.8 percent of respondents at age group 21-30 years and the least percentage of 18.3 percent respondents were at the age level of 41 years and above. With regard to their education level, the maximum of 54.8 percent of the teachers had a Bachelor degree in Education while 7.5 percent of the teachers had qualification of Master degree in various subjects. The table also indicated that the majority of 60.2 percent of the respondents had work experience of 1-10 years while only 14.5 percent of the teachers had work experience of 21 years and above.

The data collected from the fields of study regarding personal characteristics and leadership styles were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentages. While the information extracted from the interviews was analyzed using content analysis. According to the findings, the principals of the research site were confirmed to be significantly practicing consultative leadership style (75.8 percent) followed by benevolent authoritative leadership style (14.5 percent) and 9.7 percent of the teachers perceived their principals as participative group leadership. The amazing yet positive thing about current findings is that there wasn’t any principal perceived to be applying an exploitative authoritative leadership approach among the secondary schools in Thimphu Thromde, Bhutan.

**Recommendations**

The possibility of transforming the leadership approaches may be achieved through execution of the note of recommendations cited below;

**Policy Makers**

The findings about the leadership styles of principal’s demand changes to better their leadership approaches from benevolent authoritative to participative group leadership style. This could be possible only when the concerned agencies such as the Education Monitoring and Support Service Division (EMSSD, MoE) Human Resource Management Division (HRMD, MoE) provide frequent short-term training, workshops and seminars in the relevant fields of study to enhance their leadership approaches. The findings also required the policy makers to allocate additional budget to sustain the training programs on leadership skills and general management in the near future. This suggestion slightly diverts away from the empirical findings. However, the existing trend of recruiting vice principals and teachers directly as principals from interviews without an availing orientation program on the relevant fields would lead to misconception and mismanagement of schools due to lack of managerial skills in the newly appointed principals. This could be one of the causes of weakening the leadership approaches of principals. The policy makers are suggested to look into this area and get the inconveniences rectified in the future.
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