



Perception towards Influence Tactics and Turnover Intentions in Technical Higher Education

Pallavi

Research Scholar
Christ University

Harold Andrew Patrick

Professor & Head – OB & HRM
Institute of Management
Christ University

Abstract

Western interstate commission for higher education (WICHE) predicted faculty shortage, reasons cited included retirement bulge, declining numbers of doctoral recipients interested in a faculty career, professional and institutional work life issues, satisfaction, work intentions to leave and demographic variables are considered, institutions of higher education do not enjoy the public respect and trust that they have in the past and faculty members showed that they are seriously considering it. Greater depth of understanding of the professional work lives of faculty members in the areas of teaching, research and service is the need of the hour, are faculty members involved in productive results and what tactics are used in influencing process, and while faculty members spending the time, is it resulting in quality performance bothers educational institution, there is a need for educational institutions to understand what factors influence faculty member's decision and what tactics to be adopted to sustain ability faculty members. Often it is not clear what impacts the quality of work life of faculty has on their performance or retention. Quality of work life on college and university campuses appear to have declined in recent years increasing turnover intentions, to what extent it varies and for what reasons it varies. Retaining the ability and productive faculty members is important to campuses, if education leaders want to take steps to retain by depleting retention, identify those issues that matters and take necessary actions. This study concentrated on knowing professionals intension to stay, influence tactics adopted by faculty members and higher authorities and see whether demographic variables affect the influence tactics process.

498 faculty and 45 educational leaders were the respondents from various higher educational institutions, results of the study reveal that *73.3% of educational leaders are interested to stay for foreseeable future in the same institution whereas only 29.5% of faculty members are interested to stay for foreseeable future in the same institution*, there exist significant difference in the perception of influence tactics by education leaders and faculty members across demographics, there is mismatch in the perception of educational leaders and faculty members across marital status, age, experience and qualification. Further detailed investigation process is portrayed in the article.

Key words: Higher education, influence tactics, educational leaders, turnover intentions.

Introduction

Can you try in understanding the meaning of the equation? $= + \Delta$, the answer would YES, if you had learnt earlier in college days, respective subject faculty would have helped in understanding this formulae (first law of Motion). If the same question is posed to an employee, he would try to regain their college days and memorize the golden days to share their way of learning things and remember the faculty member who has taught this equation and share even the naughty things they enjoyed, especially if they were backbenchers, backbench students are identified by faculty members first than others. Faculty tries to identify, point out, mentor and try to make realize the strengths of student to excel in their life and academics as viewed by our scientist and former president



A P J Kalam “the best brains of the nation may be found on the last benches of the classroom”. Great teachers inspire and exhibit integrity”. Every individual tries to influence intentionally or unintentionally, students try to influence friends, teachers and surroundings. The psychological explanation for interpersonal influence involves the motives and perception of the target person in regulation to be actions of the agent (influencer) and the context in which the interaction occurs, influencing process remains constant but the results differ on the individual’s usage, influencing process sometimes happens intentionally or unintentionally.

Faculty member try to influence colleagues, subordinates and educational leaders and in the same manner educational leaders tries to influence faculty member, students and institutional environment for favorable results. Rost, 1993, defines influence tactics as “an interactive process in which people attempt to convince other people to believe and/or act in certain ways” wherein Yukl, 2014 explains influence tactics as “the type of behavior used *intentionally* to influence the attitudes and behavior of another person”. 11 types of influence tactics are *Rational Persuasion* – the agent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to show a proposal, *Aspiring* – Agent explains how carrying out a request will benefit the target personally or help advance the target person’s career, *Inspirational appeal* - Agent makes an appeal to values and ideals or seeks to arouse the target person’s emotions to gain commitment for a request or proposal, *Consultation* – The agent encourages the target to suggest improvements, *Collaboration* – Agent offers to provide relevant resources and assistance, *Ingratiation* – The agent uses praise and flattery words, *Exchange* – Agent offers an incentive, suggests an exchange of favor, *Personal Appeal*- The agent asks the target out of feelings of loyalty and friendship to carry out a request, *Coalition* - Get someone else to persuade you to comply, *Legitimizing* – The agent take the help of policy manuals or legal documents, *Pressure* –The agent uses demands, threats, frequent checking for favourable response. These tactics are adopted to avoid turnover intentions and try to stretch for a long period in the same institution as intention to leave was conceived to be a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization. Identification of factors that influence turnover intentions is considered important and to be effective in reducing actual turnover. (Tett & Meyer, 1993 and Samad, 2006).

Literature review on influence tactics and turnover intentions

Great scholars have worked on the concept of influence tactics and turnover intentions using various variables but few works have witnessed education sectors, sustaining quality faculty is become challenging task for institution heads, (Bothma & Roodt, 2012, DuPlooy & Roodt, 2010, Greyling & Stanz, 2010, Griffeth, Horn, & Gaertner, 2000; Kotze & Roodt, 2005; Mendes & Stander, 2011) this is possible only when the quality faculty is involved in the process of education, a study described turnover intentions as individual’s behavioural intention or conation (Bester, 2012); turnover intentions as the extent to which an employee plans to leave the organization (Rudramuniyaiah, 2008); educational leaders need to understand the behavioural intention (Jaros, Jermier, Koehler & Sincich, 1993; Muliawan, Green & Robb, 2009), few works consider that behavioural intension reflects actual behaviour (Jaros, Jermier, Koehler & Sincich, 1993; Muliawan, Green & Robb, 2009), it is been established that there exist a positive relationship with actual turnover (Byrne, 2005; Hendrix, Robbins, Miller & Summers, 1998, Steensma, Van Breukelen & Sturm, 2004) and few studies elucidate turnover is the result of coping strategy used by employees to escape the current situation (cf. Petriglieri, 2001), though early 1960’s and 1970’s show decline in turnover intension (Cartter, 1976 found that doctorate holding faculty change their institutional affiliations on an annual basis declined from 8% in mid 60’s to 1.4% in 1972, National Science Foundation reported decline from 3.5% leaving academics to 1% in late 1970’s (Finkelstein, 1984)), there is an boom in recent days, there are studies in understanding satisfaction of faculty members (Boyer, Altbachm & Whitlaw, 1994; Olsen, Maple & Stage, 1995; Tack & Patitu, 1992), gender and minority issues of faculty members (Aquirre, 2000; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Turner and Myers, 2000), faculty members motivation, productivity &



behaviour (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995), rewards and salary (Boyer, 1990; Hagedorn, 1996; Matier, 1990; & McKeachie, 1979) and instructional and learning technologies of faculty members (Groves and Zemel, 2000; Privateer, 1999; Rice & Miller, 2001), the above studies are perceived as relevant to the work life issues resulting to turnover of faculty members forcing retention strategies to be initialized. (Barnes, Agago & Coombs, 1998; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Manger & Eikeland, 1990; Smart, 1990; & Weiler, 1985) and some studies concentrated on understanding the influence tactics, authors like Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) worked on reducing 370 influence tactics to a small number of categories: assertiveness, rationality, ingratiation, exchange, coalition, upward appeal, blocking and, finally, the use of sanctions. Some new tactics were added to the list by Yukl and Falbe, namely, inspirational appeals and consultation to support the same few researchers have tried to work on the same arena (Blickle, 2000; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). All the above studies have concentrated on different variables but few works justify the usage of influence tactics involved in the campuses and universities. Many studies of influence tactics focus on descriptive research questions: identification and categorization of the most frequently used tactics. In recent times, researchers tried and showed their interest in understanding the determinants of the use of influence tactics, direction of influence attempt (Deluga & Perry, 1991; Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Personality factors (e.g. Machiavellianism) also seem to be important (Grams & Rogers, 1990). Self-esteem factors such as self-esteem (Raven, 1992), status (Stahelski & Paynton, 1995), leadership style (Deluga & Souza, 1991), one-to-one or group situations (Guerin, 1995), organizational culture (Steensma, Jansen, & Vonk, 2003), expectation of future interaction (Van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003) and the various objectives of influence attempts (Yukl, Guinan, & Sottolano, 1995). Faculty and educational leaders are considered in this study, for favourable results one takes the help of influence tactics. This research tries to compare and contrast the influencing process of both faculty and educational leaders (educational leaders) across demographic variables.

Objectives of the study

1. To understand the intension to stay/leave of educational leaders and faculty members.
2. To find if there are differences in influence tactics adopted by educational leaders and faculty members in Technical Educational Institutions across demographics (gender, marital status, age, qualification, corporate experience, academic experience and present institution experience).
3. To find out the most frequently adopted Influence tactics by educational leaders in Technical Educational Institutions.

Research Methodology

The study selected 55 technical educational institutions from the 182 technical institutions, constituting to 30% of the total population, 26 (Engineering), 19 (MBA) and 10 (MCA) institutions were selected using Stratified Judgmental Sampling. The study is a Descriptive one; quantitative results was achieved with the help of questionnaire to faculty and educational leaders (Dean, Principal, Vice principal, Program coordinator and Head of Department) of the respective institution. Data was collected using Influence Behaviour Questionnaire (IBQ) by Yukl Gary, 2002 and Intention to stay scale by Dilyis Robinson, 2 items measuring intension to stay and 2 items measuring to leave.

1200 Faculty Questionnaires were distributed among Engineering, MBA and MCA colleges, out of which only 498 questionnaires were returned resulting to response rate of 41.5% and 150 Management Questionnaires were distributed among Head Of Department/s (HOD), Vice Principal, Principal, Director, Dean and Program Coordinator who are considered as educational leaders in this study, out of which only 45 usable questionnaires were returned resulting to 30%.



Analysis and Findings

Table 1: Indicating percentage distribution of intension to stay or leave the present institution

Intention to stay/leave	Educational Leaders		Faculty Members	
	N	% age	N	% age
Plan to leave this institution as soon as possible	00	00.0%	97	19.5%
Likely to leave within the next year	00	00.0%	125	25.1%
Likely to stay for another year	12	26.7%	129	25.9%
Plan to stay for the foreseeable future	33	73.3%	147	29.5%
Total	45	100%	498	100%

Education leaders are willing to stay in the present institution for the foreseeable future and 55% of faculty members are willing to stay for the foreseeable future and 45% of respondents are willing to leave the institution as soon as possible.

Table 2: indicating Reliability test

Influence tactics	Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
Educational leaders	0.677	11
Faculty members	0.608	11

The overall reliability test results indicated a good internal consistency of influence tactics.

Table 3: indicating influence tactics across gender (t test)

Influence tactics dimensions	Educational leaders					Faculty members			
	Gender	Mean	SD	T value	Sig (2 tailed)	Mean	SD	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
Consultation	Male	4.43	.778	-1.443	.156	3.59	1.075	-2.862	.004
	Female	4.80	.422			3.85	.956		
Inspirational Appeals	Male	4.06	1.083	-.123	.903	3.03	1.169	-2.064	.040
	Female	4.10	.316			3.24	1.116		
Ingratiation	Male	2.91	1.245	2.443	.019	2.50	1.362	1.298	.195
	Female	1.90	.738			2.34	1.353		
Legitimizing Tactics	Male	3.14	1.167	3.717	.001	2.74	1.437	-1.096	.273
	Female	1.70	.675			2.88	1.355		

From the above table, it is inferred that there exist difference in the influence tactics adopted by educational leaders and faculty members across gender. Faculty use consultation tactics and inspirational appeals influencing educational leaders where as educational leaders use ingratiation and legitimating tactics in influencing faculty members. There is difference in tactics adopted by male and female of faculty members and educational leaders.

Table 4: indicating influence tactics dimensions across marital status (t test)

Influence tactics dimensions	Variable	Educational leaders				Faculty members			
		Mean	SD	T value	Sig (2 tailed)	Mean	SD	T value	Sig (2 tailed)
Pressure	Married	3.05	1.681	-.286	.777	2.16	1.229	-2.635	.009
	Single	3.33	1.528			2.54	1.354		

From the above table, it is understood that marital status does not affect the educational leaders influencing process, whether single or married tries to influence in the same manner but educational leaders state that marital status of faculty members affects the influencing process, they try to pressurise



the educational leaders in getting favourable results, frequency of using this tactic is used more by unmarried faculty members when compared to married faculty members.

Table 5: indicating ANOVA for Influence tactics dimensions across Corporate Experience

Influence tactics dimensions		Educational leaders				Faculty members			
		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rational Persuasion	Between Groups	15.24	5.08	2.03	.13	15.67	5.223	2.94	.03
	Within Groups	102.67	2.50			877.56	1.78		
	Total	117.91				893.25			
Consultation	Between Groups	4.798	1.60	3.56	.02	4.36	1.46	1.40	.24
	Within Groups	18.45	.45			513.58	1.04		
	Total	23.24				517.94			
Collaboration	Between Groups	5.02	1.67	2.23	.10	23.14	7.71	5.00	.002
	Within Groups	30.76	.75			761.86	1.54		
	Total	35.78				784.10			
Apprising	Between Groups	20.12	6.71	3.41	.03	3.33	1.11	.82	.49
	Within Groups	80.68	1.97			673.65	1.36		
	Total	100.80				676.98			
Legitimizing Tactics	Between Groups	20.91	6.97	6.26	.001	7.61	2.54	1.31	.27
	Within Groups	45.67	1.11			958.65	1.94		
	Total	66.58				966.26			
Coalition Tactics	Between Groups	16.39	5.46	2.57	.07	16.12	5.37	3.49	.02
	Within Groups	87.25	2.13			760.04	1.54		
	Total	103.64				776.16			

From the above table, faculty members use rational persuasion, collaboration and coalition tactics in influencing educational leaders and consultation, apprising and legitimating tactics are adopted in influencing faculty members, corporate experience has got significant role in influencing process.

Table 6: indicating ANOVA for Influence tactics dimensions across Academic Experience

Influence tactics dimensions		Educational leaders				Faculty members			
		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rational Persuasion	Between Groups	50.08	16.69	10.09	.00	.305	.102	.056	.98
	Within Groups	67.83	1.65			892.94	1.81		
	Total	117.91				893.25			
Inspirational Appeals	Between Groups	1.77	.590	.620	.61	12.00	4.01	3.10	.03
	Within Groups	39.03	.952			638.86	1.29		



	Total	40.80				650.88			
<i>Collaboration</i>	Between Groups	8.96	2.99	4.57	.01	7.57	2.53	1.60	.19
	Within Groups	26.81	.65			777.42	1.57		
	Total	35.78				784.10			
<i>Apprising</i>	Between Groups	34.48	11.49	7.11	.00	5.25	1.75	1.29	.28
	Within Groups	66.32	1.62			671.73	1.36		
	Total	100.80				676.98			
<i>Ingratiation</i>	Between Groups	11.86	3.95	3.01	.04	1.06	.353	.19	.90
	Within Groups	53.78	1.31			915.73	1.85		
	Total	65.64				916.79			
<i>Personal Appeals</i>	Between Groups	40.71	13.57	7.09	.00	.146	.049	.02	.99
	Within Groups	78.49	1.91			1050.87	2.13		
	Total	119.20				1051.01			
<i>Exchange</i>	Between Groups	2.632	.88	.67	.58	18.93	6.31	3.99	.01
	Within Groups	53.95	1.32			781.08	1.58		
	Total	56.58				800.01			
<i>Legitimizing Tactics</i>	Between Groups	17.674	5.89	4.94	.01	7.31	2.44	1.25	.29
	Within Groups	48.904	1.19			958.95	1.94		
	Total	66.578				966.26			
<i>Pressure</i>	Between Groups	24.293	8.10	3.44	.03	5.99	1.99	1.26	.29
	Within Groups	96.507	2.35			785.53	1.59		
	Total	120.80				791.51			

From the above table, it is understood that academic experience articulates the influencing process, both faculty members and educational leader's academic experience reflects their usage of influence tactics. Educational leaders apart from coalition tactics, consultation, inspirational appeals and exchange tactics, adopt all other tactics in influencing faculty members; depending upon the situation, educational leaders use influence tactics to influence though it may be irrelevant or detrimental to faculty members, educational leaders often have multiple motives to the extent of selfish or selfless, mixture of cost and benefits, unintended, good intentions may be some of the reasons for influencing faculty members. Faculty members with academic experience are aware of handling the situation in such environment; they take the help of inspirational appeal and exchange tactics in the influencing educational leaders.



Table 7: indicating ANOVA for Influence tactics dimensions across Age

Influence tactics dimensions		Educational leaders				Faculty members			
		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<i>Rational Persuasion</i>	Between Groups	47.61	15.87	9.26	.00	13.99	4.66	2.62	.05
	Within Groups	70.30	1.72			879.25	1.78		
	Total	117.91				893.25			
<i>Consultation</i>	Between Groups	4.70	1.57	3.47	.03	3.71	1.24	1.19	.31
	Within Groups	18.54	.45			514.24	1.04		
	Total	23.24				517.94			
<i>Collaboration</i>	Between Groups	8.06	2.69	3.98	.014	14.53	4.84	3.11	.036
	Within Groups	27.71	.68			770.47	1.56		
	Total	35.78				784.10			
<i>Apprising</i>	Between Groups	21.83	7.28	3.78	.02	1.72	.57	.42	.74
	Within Groups	78.97	1.93			675.26	1.37		
	Total	100.80				676.98			
<i>Legitimizing Tactics</i>	Between Groups	18.55	6.19	5.28	.004	9.10	3.03	1.57	.20
	Within Groups	48.02	1.17			957.16	1.94		
	Total	66.58				966.26			
<i>Coalition Tactics</i>	Between Groups	15.06	5.02	2.32	.09	18.42	6.14	4.00	.01
	Within Groups	88.59	2.16			757.75	1.53		
	Total	103.64				776.16			

From the above table it is understood that age reflects the type of influence tactics adopted by both faculty members and educational leaders. Rational persuasion, consultation, collaboration, apprising and legitimating tactics are adopted by educational leaders in influencing faculty members. Faculty members take the help of rational persuasion, collaboration and coalition tactics in influencing educational leaders. Rational persuasion and collaboration tactics are adopted commonly by both educational leaders and faculty members.

Table 8: indicating ANOVA for Influence tactics dimensions across Qualification

Influence tactics dimensions		Educational leaders				Faculty members			
		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<i>Rational Persuasion</i>	Between Groups	57.98	19.33	13.22	.00	13.99	4.66	2.62	.05
	Within Groups	59.93	1.46			879.25	1.78		
	Total	117.91				893.25			
<i>Consultation</i>	Between Groups	4.62	1.54	3.39	.027	3.71	1.24	1.19	.31
	Within Groups	18.62	.45			514.24	1.04		
	Total	23.24				517.94			
<i>Apprising</i>	Between Groups	26.37	8.79	4.84	.01	1.72	.57	.42	.74
	Within Groups	74.43	1.82			675.26	1.37		
	Total	100.80				676.98			
<i>Personal Appeals</i>	Between Groups	38.02	12.67	6.40	.001	16.29	5.43	2.59	.05
	Within Groups	81.18	1.98			1034.72	2.10		
	Total	119.20				1051.01			



Legitimizing Tactics	Between Groups	19.09	6.36	5.49	.003	9.10	3.03	1.57	.20
	Within Groups	47.49	1.16			957.16	1.94		
	Total	66.58				966.25			
Coalition Tactics	Between Groups	15.38	5.13	2.38	.08	18.42	6.14	4.00	.008
	Within Groups	88.26	2.15			757.75	1.53		
	Total	103.64				776.161			

From the above table it is understood qualification matters, highly qualified faculty members try to influence educational leaders out of personal appeal, or take the help of friendship in influencing them, or depending upon the circumstances take the help of others in influencing educational leaders (coalition tactics). Highly qualified educational leaders take the help of rational persuasion, consultation, apprising, and legitimating tactics in influencing faculty members.

Table 9: indicating ANOVA for Influence tactics dimensions across present institution experience

Influence tactics dimensions		Educational leaders				Faculty members			
		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rational Persuasion	Between Groups	42.14	14.05	7.60	.00	1.10	.55	.31	.74
	Within Groups	75.77	1.85			892.14	1.80		
	Total	117.91				893.25			
Consultation	Between Groups	1.55	.51	.97	.42	6.80	3.40	3.29	.04
	Within Groups	21.71	.53			511.15	1.03		
	Total	23.24				517.94			
Collaboration	Between Groups	8.97	2.99	4.57	.01	3.96	1.98	1.25	.29
	Within Groups	26.81	.65			781.04	1.58		
	Total	35.78				784.10			
Apprising	Between Groups	62.98	20.99	22.76	.00	14.35	7.17	5.36	.01
	Within Groups	37.82	.92			662.64	1.34		
	Total	100.80				676.98			
Personal Appeals	Between Groups	52.12	17.37	10.62	.00	5.46	2.73	1.29	.28
	Within Groups	67.08	1.64			1045.55	2.11		
	Total	119.20				1051.01			
Exchange	Between Groups	7.64	2.55	2.13	.11	25.26	12.63	8.07	.00
	Within Groups	48.94	1.19			774.75	1.57		
	Total	56.58				800.01			
Legitimizing Tactics	Between Groups	12.72	4.24	3.23	.032	3.34	1.67	.86	.43
	Within Groups	53.86	1.31			962.92	1.95		
	Total	66.58				966.26			
Pressure	Between Groups	21.28	7.09	2.92	.05	.05	.03	.02	.99
	Within Groups	99.52	2.43			791.46	1.60		
	Total	120.80				791.51			

From the above table, it is understood that present institution experience and environment matters, faculty members may stretch for long years due to many reasons in the same institution, it may



emotional bonding, environment, pay, perks or satisfied with personal attention of educational leaders, whatever may the reason, faculty members take the help of consultation, apprising and exchange tactics in influencing educational leaders, educational leaders having vast experience in the same institution influence faculty members using rational persuasion, collaboration, apprising, personal appeals, legitimating tactics and pressure tactics for favourable results.

Table 10: indicating Mean and Standard Deviation of most frequently adopted Influence Tactics

Influence Tactics dimensions	Educational leaders		Faculty Members	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Consultation	4.51	0.73	3.73	1.02
Inspirational Appeals	4.07	0.96	3.14	1.14

From the above table it is understood that Consultation dimension (4.51) (3.73) is the most frequently adopted tactic followed by Inspirational Appeals (4.07) (3.14) by both faculty members and educational leaders and the least used tactics by educational leaders is Apprising (2.60) and least used tactic by faculty members is Exchange (2.21).

Discussion

According to the analysis, educational leaders are willing to stay in the same institution for foreseeable future and only 29.5% faculty members are willing to stay with the same institution for long period; institution are feeling the heat of turnover intensions.

The most frequently adopted tactics by both educational leaders and faculty members are consultation and inspirational appeals, both married and unmarried faculty members feel that educational leaders often use pressure tactic for favourable responses, faculty members need to analyse the pressure that educational leaders undergo and act accordingly. Likeminded people think likely is the common perception, along with it, same age group individuals think and act in similar manner or say their wave length matches, both educational leaders and faculty members with same age group use rational persuasion and collaboration tactics in influencing process. Age can be viewed as a tool to avoid turnover intensions by having personal meetings, faculty members and educational leaders exposed for many years in the same institution have something in common; highly qualified educational leaders and faculty members use soft tactic like apprising tactic, this tactic is commonly accepted by both educational leaders and faculty members working for many years in the same institution.

After having exposed and experienced, one is in better situation in understanding the environment, but reverse is the situation in this study, huge mismatch between educational leaders and faculty members working for the same institutions, there is an urgent need for personal meeting to increase understanding level, this is possible by using grape wine methods like trips, get together or tea party may help in increasing transparency and understanding each other is the need of the hour for quality results and sustaining of quality faculty members.

Conclusion

Each table shows the difference in influence process of educational leaders and faculty members for each demographic variable, to sum up, educational leaders need to use soft tactics as soft spoken tactics include Ingratiation, Consultation, Inspirational, Exchange and Personal appeals (Schmidt, 1985; Lamude, 1994; Falbe & Yukl). Using soft tactics may help in sustaining quality faculty members in the academic environment. Not only the roles of educational leaders and faculty members affect the sustainment of quality even the availability of resources is attainment of goals affect. Sustainment of quality should not only be the goal but getting recognized over the globe is also essential. There should exist common understanding between all members of the institution whether be it management or educational leaders or faculty members. One very relevant indicator of leadership effectiveness is the



extent to which the performance of the team or organization is enhanced and the attainment of goals is facilitated. (Bass, 2008; Kaiser, Hogan & Craig, 2008).

References

- Blickle, G. (2000). Influence tactics used by subordinates: An empirical analysis of the Kipnis and Schmidt subscales. *Psychological Reports*, 86, 143–154.
- Bothma F.C. Chris & Roodt Gert. The validation of the turnover intention scale. *SA journal of Human Resource Management*; Vol1, No1 (2013)
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Deluga, R. J., & Perry, J. T. (1991). The relationship of subordinate upward-influencing behavior, satisfaction, and perceived superior effectiveness with leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64, 239–252.
- Johnsrud K Linda (2002) Measuring the quality of faculty and administrative worklife: implications for College and University Campuses. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol 43, No3, June 2002.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440–452.
- Raven, B. H. (1992). A power interaction model of interpersonal influence: French and Raven thirty years later. *Journal of Behavior and Personality*, 7, 217–244.
- Rosser J Vicki (2004) Faculty Members intentions to leave: A National Study on their Worklife and Satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol 45, No 3, May 2004
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 246–257
- Steensma, H., Jansen, S., & Vonk, C. (2003). Organizational culture and the use of influence tactics by managers. *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, 30(1), 47–57.
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. Zanna (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp.115–191). San Diego, CA: Academic Press
- Van Knippenberg, B., & Steensma, H. (2003). Future interaction expectation and the use of soft and hard influence tactics. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(1), 55–67.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 132–140.
- Yukl, G., Guinan, P. J., & Sottolano, D. (1995). Influence tactics used for different objectives with subordinates, peers, and superiors. *Group and Organization Management*, 20, 272–296.
- Yukl, G., & Tracey, J. B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 525–535
- Yukl, G (2014) *Leadership in Organization*, Pearson publication, ISBN: 978-93-325-1813-1