A Study on Leader Behavior and Perceived Influence Tactics of academic leaders at technical institutions

Dr. Pallavi,

Associate Professor,
Woxsen School of Business, Kamkole,
Medak, Hyderabad, India.

Prof. Shripad Kulkarni,

Assistant Professor,
Woxsen School of Business, Kamkole,
Medak, Hyderabad, India.

ABSTRACT

To face the toughest challenges prone, leaders play a dominant role in enduring perspectives be better. Leaders through passion and dedication inspire loyal employees. Leadership is viewed as an influence attempt (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Consistently related, scenario remains constant for everybody. Academic leaders work selves to the bone in the hopes of achieving success; use techniques, behaviors and tactics to maintain the quality of education, "as education is to growth and technical higher education is to prosperity". Academic leader, for successful results influence the environment including Students, during influencing, leader used different tactics which suits the situation. Influencing is the ability to affect the behavior of others in a particular direction and influence attempt can be successful depending on efficacy of agent's capability to apply power bases. This study investigated the behaviors adopted by higher authorities, a sample of 44 & 543, usable questionnaires returned constituted to 543 (498+45) and respondents in the higher management designations were considered. Results indicated that the most frequently adopted behaviors are integration and structure, the most frequently adopted tactics are Consultation and Inspirational appeals; there exists significant influence of demographic variables on behavior and influence tactics adopted at technical institutions.

Keywords: Academic Leaders, Influence Tactics, Technical Institutions, Leadership Behavior.

INTRODUCTION:

Referring to the assemblage of corporate, every employee would wish to transit, would like to excel from within and wishes to reach the self-actualization stage (motivational theory), perpetually to reach this stage employee explore the finer nuances and one cannot deny the importance of quality. Quality is certainly a key determinant and mediocre bridging the gap between the organization and knowledge.

Effectiveness of a leader depends on the pattern of behavior that suits for the situation and reflects the concern for tasks, objectives and high concern for relationships, Organization's success majorly depends on the leader. Katz & Kahn (1978) view "leadership as an influence attempt". Influence tactics is "an interactive process in which people attempt to convince other people to believe and/or act in certain ways" (Rost, 1993, p 157). To lead apparently one needs to influence, to influence others, you need power; power is the ability to bring about changes in one's psychological environment. Power and leadership go hand in hand, leaders cannot achieve the determined goals without influencing the followers and influence is the use of power to bring about change. Attributions about subordinates and the leader's reaction are affected by leader's position power. (Kipnis, Schmidt, Price, & Still, 1981; McFillen & New, 1979, as cited by Yukl.G in pg 232, leadership in organizations, 8th edition). Leadership therefore implies the relationship with power, the power to guide others. Leadership is essential to influence people to achieve mutually compatible objectives and try to avoid turnover intention. The quality of future depends on how well they respond to enduring realities in the larger world beyond their walls (Abelson, 1997). Leaders can bring change; a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of

some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics and the influence tactics adopted by the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of their followers.

Thrive for success transparent the passion for work, leader and influence tactics are the concepts which are deliberately researched on discretely. Great man theory of leadership, the trait theory, situational theory, Fielders contingency theory, Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Model, House's Path-Goal Model and the Leader-Member Exchange theory, transactional leadership theory, transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985), charismatic theory, servant leadership, authentic leadership are some of the works of various authors, few studies concentrated on women in leadership position (by Norman, 1970 as cited in Gender and Women's Leadership: A reference hand book by O'Connor. K); integrating on the principles path goal theory (House, 1996) and transformational theory to show the stronger leadership role (Vecchio et al., 2003); multi-sample and multi-level approach examining the relationship between leader and follower and followers (Dick et al., 2007).

Set of behaviors reflect the use of influence tactics directed towards others to manage impressions, enhance the performance and the information they seek to convey (Ilgen & Feldman, 1983). Over decades, concept is been researched, particularly to show that interpersonal influence theory with reference to impression management, (Jones, 1964; Schlenker, 1980; Tedeschi, 1981; and Leary, 1995) employee use influence tactics for successful outcomes. (Dreher, Dougherty & Whitely, 1989; Judge & Bretz, 1994; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Thacker & Wayne, 1995), emphasized on broad range of variables including direction of influence attempt (Mowday, 1978; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Erez & Rim, 1982; Case et al., 1988; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl, Guinan & Sottolano, 1995), outcome of the influence attempt, personal and contextual variables (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Dubrin, 1991; Erez & Rim,1982), and frequency of tactic use (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl & Tracey, 1992), helps in understanding the effectiveness of tactic use (Mowday, 1978; Yukl & Tracey, 1992), objective of influence attempt (Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Schmidt Kipnis, 1984; Erez, Rim& Keider, 1986; Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl, Guinan & Sottolano, 1995), sequencing of influence tactics and combination of tactics (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984).

NEED AND RATIONALE OF THE STUDY:

For the little over the decades, researcher realized that Leader behavior and Influence tactics are researched on independently, audacity for further research in combination of these two variables raised. This article concentrates on knowing the leader's behavior that individuals play when they hold power positions, what tactics are adopted to suit the situation and how it hinders the growth of individual and institutional goals and their intention to stay/leave. This research will in detail examine the leadership behavior having demographics in place. Vice Principal, Dean, Coordinator, and Head of Department are considered as leaders of the respective institution.

RESEARCH DESIGN:

Descriptive study of 55 selected technical institutions at Bangalore approved by AICTE. 30% of the colleges represented total population: 26 (Engineering), 19 (MBA) and 10 (MCA) institutions using Stratified Judgmental Sampling. Quantitative analysis is achieved using questionnaire to Management (Principal, Vice Principal, Dean, Coordinator, and Head of Department) of the respective institutions. Data was collected using Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ, form XII, 1962), Influence Tactics tool (Yukl Gary, 2011) and intention to stay/leave by Dilyis Robinson.

RESPONDENT PROFILE:

Respondent's profile on demographic variables likes gender, age, marital status; designation, corporate experience and institution type were concentrated on. 53.2% were female faculty, 55.2% were between the age group of 25-35, 26.5% between 36-45, 9.4% between 46-55 and <56 years of age constituted to 8.8%, 76.3% - Assistant Professors, 13.9% - Professors and 9.8% - Associate Professors, 80% - married, 46.4% - corporate experience between 2-5 years, 14.7% - >11 years of corporate experience, 52.6% - work for private institution and the most astonishing situation was when the researcher got to know that 73.3% of the respondents were willing to see a foreseeable future in the same institution.

Reliability test was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha's and results indicated good internal consistency for leader behaviour and influence tactics. Normality test showed that Leader behaviour scale is normally distributed as Shapiro-wilk sig >.05 and Kolmogorov is also sig > .05 and Skewness and kurtosis values show that Influence Tactics approximately normally distributed as Z values is < 1.96.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Objective 1: To find the most frequently adopted Behaviour and the least preferred Behaviour of academic leaders in technical institutions

Table 1: indicating the most frequently adopted Behaviour and influence tactics of academic leaders in technical institutions

Behaviour dimensions and influence tactics	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Structure	44	2.40	4.80	3.86	.56
Integration	44	1.80	5.00	3.91	.65
Consultation	44	2	5	4.51	0.73
Inspirational Appeals	44	1	5	4.07	0.96

The above table depicts that Integration (3.91) is the most frequently adopted behavior by academic leaders followed by Structure (3.86), and the most frequently adopted influence tactics is Consultation tactic followed by Inspirational Appeals.

Objective 2: To find the significant difference in behavior dimensions and influence tactics adopted by academic leaders in technical educational institution across demographic variables (age, qualification, job title, type of department, type of institution, corporate experience, academic experience, and present institution experience)

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and influence tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and age

Table 2: Indicating ANOVA for Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted across the Age

Leader Behaviour dimensions	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Representation	1.577	3	.526	2.882	.047	Between Groups	Rational Persuasion	47.61	3	15.87	9.26	.000
	7.480	41	.182			Within Groups		70.30	41	1.72		
	9.058	44				Total		**117.91**	**44**			
Reconciliation	4.768	3	1.589	5.187	.004	Between Groups	Consultation	4.70	3	1.57	3.47	.025
	12.560	41	.306			Within Groups		18.54	41	.45		
	17.328	44				Total		**23.24**	**44**			
Tolerance Freedom	2.716	3	.905	3.136	.036	Between Groups	Collaboration	8.063	3	2.688	3.976	.014
	11.836	41	.289			Within Groups		27.714	41	.676		
	14.552	44				Total		**35.778**	**44**			
Consideration	2.911	3	.970	3.307	.029	Between Groups	Apprising	21.830	3	7.277	3.778	.018
	12.029	41	.293			Within Groups		78.970	41	1.926		
	14.940	44				Total		**100.800**	**44**			
Integration	4.614	3	1.538	4.406	.009	Between Groups	Legitimating Tactics	18.554	3	6.185	5.280	.004
	14.314	41	.349			Within Groups		48.024	41	1.171		
	18.928	44				Total		**66.578**	**44**			

From the post hoc comparison, academic leader's behavior relies on age, leader with different age groups use different tactics, for example academic leaders between 46-55 years of age portray representation behavior and majority of the times use rational persuasion tactic in getting their job done. Significant difference was found in the behavior dimensions and different age groups and significant difference was found between different age groups and tactics adopted highlighting that middle age group react differently with old generation and young generation.

The null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and age groups is supported.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and influence tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and qualification

Table 3: Indicating ANOVA for Behaviour dimensions and influence tactics across Qualification

Leader Behaviour dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Reconciliation	5.976	3	1.992	7.194	.001	Between Groups	Rational Persuasion	57.982	3	19.327	13.222	.000
	11.352	41	.277			Within Groups		59.930	41	1.462		
	17.328	44				Total		**117.911**	**44**			
Persuasion	1.870	3	.623	5.773	.002	Between Groups	Consultation	4.621	3	1.540	3.391	.027
	4.427	41	.108			Within Groups		18.623	41	.454		
	6.296	44				Total		**23.244**	**44**			
Structure	5.341	3	1.780	8.665	.000	Between Groups	Apprising	26.371	3	8.790	4.842	.006
	8.424	41	.205			Within Groups		74.429	41	1.815		
	13.766	44				Total		**100.800**	**44**			
Tolerance Freedom	3.444	3	1.148	4.237	.011	Between Groups	Personal Appeals	38.021	3	12.674	6.401	.001
	11.109	41	.271			Within Groups		81.179	41	1.980		
	14.552	44				Total		**119.200**	**44**			
Role Assumption	4.040	3	1.347	4.196	.011	Between Groups	Legitimating Tactics	19.086	3	6.362	5.492	.003
	13.159	41	.321			Within Groups		47.492	41	1.158		
	17.199	44				Total		**66.578**	**44**			
Consideration	6.136	3	2.045	9.524	.000	Between Groups						
	8.804	41	.215			Within Groups						
	14.940	44				Total						
Integration	6.942	3	2.314	7.916	.000	Between Groups						
	11.986	41	.292			Within Groups						
	18.928	44				Total						

From the above table, it is inferred the qualification reflects both behaviour and the tactics adopted. Academic leaders with different qualification levels use different tactics.

The null hypothesis failed to be accepted and alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and educational qualifications is supported.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions across job title (Dean, Vice Principal, Program Coordinator and Head of Department).

Table 4: Indicating ANOVA for Behaviour dimensions across job title

Leader Behaviour dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Reconciliation	5.279	5	1.056	3.418	.012	Between Groups	Rational Persuasion	30.422	5	6.084	2.712	.034
	12.049	39	.309			Within Groups		87.489	39	2.243		
	17.328	44				Total		**117.911**	**44**			
Role Assumption	6.739	5	1.348	5.025	.001	Between Groups	Inspirational Appeals	11.730	5	2.346	3.148	.018
	10.461	39	.268			Within Groups		29.070	39	.745		
	17.199	44				Total		**40.800**	**44**			
Consideration	6.874	5	1.375	6.647	.000	Between Groups	Exchange	14.315	5	2.863	2.642	.038
	8.066	39	.207			Within Groups		42.263	39	1.084		
	14.940	44				Total		**56.578**	**44**			
Integration	5.333	5	1.067	3.060	.020	Between Groups						
	13.595	39	.349			Within Groups						
	18.928	44				Total						

Power bases depend on the designation of academic leaders, significant difference was found in the behaviour of academic leader reflects by the job title they hold and the tactics adopted differs accordingly.

The null hypothesis failed to be accepted and alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions across job title (Dean, Vice Principal, Program Coordinator and Head of Department) is supported.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and the type of department

Table 5: Indicating ANOVA for Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted across department

Leader Behaviour dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Persuasion	Between Groups	.961	2	.480	3.782	.031
	Within Groups	5.335	42	.127		
	Total	**6.296**	**44**			
Role Assumption	Between Groups	3.534	2	1.767	5.432	.008
	Within Groups	13.665	42	.325		
	Total	**17.199**	**44**			
Superior Orientation	Between Groups	1.929	2	.964	2.982	.062
	Within Groups	13.584	42	.323		
	Total	**15.512**	**44**			

Type of department does not affect the type of tactics adopted by academic leaders but yes the academic leader behaviour differs depending on the type of department one works for.

The null hypothesis failed to be accepted and alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions of academic leaders in Technical institutions and the type of department is supported.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in behavior dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and the type of institution worked for (Government, Aided and Self-financed)

Table 6: Indicating ANOVA for Behaviour dimensions and tactics across the type of institution and Behaviour

Leader Behavior dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Representation	1.583	2	.792	4.448	.018	Between Groups	Rational Persuasion	26.509	2	13.254	6.091	.005
	7.475	42	.178			Within Groups		91.402	42	2.176		
	9.058	44				Total		**117.911**	**44**			
Reconciliation	4.899	2	2.450	8.278	.001	Between Groups	Apprising	30.843	2	15.422	9.259	.000
	12.429	42	.296			Within Groups		69.957	42	1.666		
	17.328	44				Total		**100.800**	**44**			
Persuasion	.934	2	.467	3.656	.034	Between Groups	Exchange	8.365	2	4.182	3.643	.035
	5.363	42	.128			Within Groups		48.213	42	1.148		
	6.296	44				Total		**56.578**	**44**			
Structure	4.031	2	2.015	8.695	.001	Between Groups						
	9.735	42	.232			Within Groups						
	13.766	44				Total						
Tolerance Freedom	3.512	2	1.756	6.680	.003	Between Groups						
	11.041	42	.263			Within Groups						
	14.552	44				Total						
Role Assumption	8.633	2	4.317	21.166	.000	Between Groups						
	8.566	42	.204			Within Groups						
	17.199	44				Total						
Consideration	7.473	2	3.736	21.016	.000	Between Groups						
	7.467	42	.178			Within Groups						
	14.940	44				Total						

Leader Behavior dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Predictive Accuracy	2.823	2	1.412	6.059	.005	Between Groups						
	9.785	42	.233			Within Groups						
	12.608	44				Total						
Integration	5.395	2	2.697	8.372	.001	Between Groups						
	13.533	42	.322			Within Groups						
	18.928	44				Total						

Different type of institutions have different set of norms, rules, polices and procedure, though all institutions have to follow the thumb rule/s. Type of institution has an impact on the behavior of academic leaders and tactics adopted.

The null hypothesis failed to be accepted and alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and the type of institution worked for (Government, Aided and Self-financed) is supported.

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and corporate experience

Table 7: Indicating the number, mean, standard deviation, df and t-value regarding Behaviour dimensions across the corporate experience

Leader Behavior dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Tolerance Freedom	6.596	3	2.199	11.331	.000	Between Groups	Consultation	4.798	3	1.599	3.555	.022
	7.956	41	.194			Within Groups		18.446	41	.450		
	14.552	44				Total		**23.244**	**44**			
Role Assumption	4.351	3	1.450	4.628	.007	Between Groups	Apprising	20.122	3	6.707	3.409	.026
	12.848	41	.313			Within Groups		80.678	41	1.968		
	17.199	44				Total		**100.800**	**44**			
Consideration	2.617	3	.872	2.903	.046	Between Groups	Legitimating Tactics	20.908	3	6.969	6.257	.001
	12.323	41	.301			Within Groups		45.670	41	1.114		
	14.940	44				Total		**66.578**	**44**			
Integration	5.646	3	1.882	5.810	.002	Between Groups						
	13.282	41	.324			Within Groups						
	18.928	44				Total						

Corporate experience does affect the behavior dimensions, academic leaders with different years of corporate experience adopt different behaviors and influence tactics is also dependent on corporate experience.

The null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical Educational Institution and corporate experience is supported.

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and academic experience

Table 8: Indicating ANOVA for Behaviour dimensions and tactics across the Academic Experience

Leader Behaviour dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Reconciliation	4.579	3	1.526	4.908	.005	Between Groups	Rational Persuasion	50.081	3	16.694	10.090	.000
	12.749	41	.311			Within Groups		67.830	41	1.654		

Leader Behaviour dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	17.328	44				Total		117.911	44			
Structure	3.090	3	1.030	3.956	.014	Between Groups	Collaboration	8.964	3	2.988	4.569	.008
	10.676	41	.260			Within Groups		26.813	41	.654		
	13.766	44				Total		35.778	44			
Tolerance Freedom	5.841	3	1.947	9.164	.000	Between Groups	Apprising	34.480	3	11.493	7.105	.001
	8.711	41	.212			Within Groups		66.320	41	1.618		
	14.552	44				Total		100.800	44			
Consideration	4.377	3	1.459	5.663	.002	Between Groups	Ingratiation	11.861	3	3.954	3.014	.041
	10.563	41	.258			Within Groups		53.784	41	1.312		
	14.940	44				Total		65.644	44			
Production Emphasis	2.069	3	.690	3.750	.018	Between Groups	Personal Appeals	40.706	3	13.569	7.087	.001
	7.539	41	.184			Within Groups		78.494	41	1.914		
	9.608	44				Total		119.200	44			
Predictive Accuracy	4.618	3	1.539	7.900	.000	Between Groups	Legitimating Tactics	17.674	3	5.891	4.939	.005
	7.990	41	.195			Within Groups		48.904	41	1.193		
	12.608	44				Total		66.578	44			
Integration	6.039	3	2.013	6.404	.001	Between Groups	Pressure	24.293	3	8.098	3.440	.025
	12.889	41	.314			Within Groups		96.507	41	2.354		
	18.928	44				Total		120.800	44			

From the above table, it is seen that academic leader behaviour is affected by the number of years of academic experience, significant difference was seen between leader behaviour and different experience groups, academic leaders influencing process depends on the number of years of academic experience.

The null hypothesis failed to be accepted and alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and academic experience is supported.

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and total number of years of experience

Table 9: Indicating ANOVA for Behaviour dimensions across Total no. of years of experience

Leader Behaviour dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Reconciliation	5.254	4	1.314	4.352	.005	Between Groups	Rational Persuasion	75.407	4	18.852	17.741	.000
	12.074	40	.302			Within Groups		42.504	40	1.063		
	17.328	44				Total		117.911	44			
Persuasion	1.692	4	.423	3.674	.012	Between Groups	Collaboration	8.448	4	2.112	3.091	.026
	4.605	40	.115			Within Groups		27.330	40	.683		
	6.296	44				Total		35.778	44			
Structure	3.515	4	.879	3.428	.017	Between Groups	Apprising	35.752	4	8.938	5.496	.001
	10.251	40	.256			Within Groups		65.048	40	1.626		
	13.766	44				Total		100.800	44			
Tolerance Freedom	7.527	4	1.882	10.713	.000	Between Groups	Personal Appeals	26.864	4	6.716	2.909	.033
	7.026	40	.176			Within Groups		92.336	40	2.308		
	14.552	44				Total		119.200	44			
Consideration	3.812	4	.953	3.425	.017	Between Groups	Legitimating Tactics	20.696	4	5.174	4.511	.004
	11.128	40	.278			Within Groups		45.882	40	1.147		
	14.940	44				Total		66.578	44			
Predictive Accuracy	6.755	4	1.689	11.542	.000	Between Groups	Pressure	55.713	4	13.928	8.560	.000
	5.853	40	.146			Within Groups		65.087	40	1.627		
	12.608	44				Total		120.800	44			

Experience cannot be explained and one need to experience the experience, the more experienced academic leader is vastly exposed and possess vast knowledge, significant difference was observed in the leader behaviour, tactics adopted and total number of years of experience.

The null hypothesis failed to be accepted and alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and total number of years of experience is supported.

Hypothesis 10: There is no significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and numbers of years of experience in the present job

Table 10: Indicating ANOVA for Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted across the number of years of experience in the present job

Leader Behaviour dimensions	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		Influence tactics	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Structure	2.782	3	.927	3.462	.025	Between Groups	Rational Persuasion	42.144	3	14.048	7.602	.000
	10.984	41	.268			Within Groups		75.767	41	1.848		
	13.766	44				Total		**117.911**	**44**			
Tolerance Freedom	2.393	3	.798	2.690	.059	Between Groups	Collaboration	8.969	3	2.990	4.573	.007
	12.159	41	.297			Within Groups		26.808	41	.654		
	14.552	44				Total		**35.778**	**44**			
Consideration	4.243	3	1.414	5.421	.003	Between Groups	Apprising	62.983	3	20.994	22.762	.000
	10.697	41	.261			Within Groups		37.817	41	.922		
	14.940	44				Total		**100.800**	**44**			
Integration	2.912	3	.971	2.485	.074	Between Groups	Personal Appeals	52.117	3	17.372	10.618	.000
	16.016	41	.391			Within Groups		67.083	41	1.636		
	18.928	44				Total		**119.200**	**44**			
						Between Groups	Legitimating Tactics	12.719	3	4.240	3.228	.032
						Within Groups		53.858	41	1.314		
						Total		**66.578**	**44**			
						Between Groups	Pressure	21.283	3	7.094	2.923	.045
						Within Groups		99.517	41	2.427		
						Total		**120.800**	**44**			

Present institutions experience does impact both the academic leader behaviour and the type of influence tactics adopted. Experience in the present institutions has got significant prominence on the behaviour of academic leaders and influence tactics adopted. In-depth analysis shows that academic leaders with different years of experience adopt different behaviour dimensions and tactics in the process of influencing their faculty members and others.

The null hypothesis failed to be accepted and alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference in Behaviour dimensions and tactics adopted by academic leaders in Technical institutions and total number of years of experience in the present job is supported.

Hypothesis 11: There is no relationship between Leader Behaviour and Influence Tactics of academic leaders in Technical Educational Institutions

Table 11: Indicating Karl Pearson's correlation coefficient between Leader behaviour and influence tactics

		Influence Tactics
Leader behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.345[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.020
	N	45

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

From the above statistical analysis, we understand that there exists a moderate positive significant relationship between leadership behaviour and influence tactics.

DISCUSSION:

Based on the findings, the most frequently adopted Behaviours are Integration and Structure, Integration concentrates on maintaining a close knit group and structure states that leaders are clear with their own role and as well as followers. The least adopted Behaviours are Tolerance uncertainty and Reconciliation. (refer table 1), so it is clear that leaders have the capability, clarity, conflict resolution and forbearance, education leaders at the time of system's disorder, understand that every problem has its own problem solving strategy, recognize and implement based on the experience and observations, there are some definite ways of promoting competencies and preventing the problems in colleges. The challenge comes when the goal is to be achieved and therefore patience is obligatory, if represented statistically, according to the results of this research article: Behavior = (Capability + Clarity) – (Conflicting + Tolerance).

Age and Behavior (refer table 2) are mutually interrelated, particularly when representing the group and reconciling divergence within the system, matured judgment cannot be substituted, theories on understanding the cognitive process used by leaders to determine the effective or ineffective performance and the appropriate reactions have helped leaders in appropriate decisions (Green & Mitchell, 1979; Martinko & Gardner, 1987; Mitchell, Green, & Wood, 1981; Wood & Mitchell, 1981) on behavioral aspects and the type of influence tactics to be adopted.

Gender and Behavior (refer table 3), there exists no difference in the leadership style whether male or female. "Gender", "sex", "women", "men", "feminine", and "masculine" are frequent terminologies have been used interchangeably when discussing leadership style and few sources define basic terms in a precise manner (Cames, et al, 2001), various scholars have worked on gender differences regarding leadership style (Titus & Gill, 2003; Lansford et al., 2010), Behavior (Bartol et al., 2003; Davis et al., 2010; Groves, 2005), and other behavior characteristics (Fusun, 2010; Powel & Butterfield, 2003; Jamali et al., 2008; Bostjancic, 2010) to show that women do not match the requirement of top management positions but scholars argue that there exists no differences in leadership style among men and women (Bartol ,1978; Dobbins and Platz, 1986; & Powell, 1990), few studies show evidence of stereotypically masculine style of leadership of women similar to men (Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Ferrario & Davidson, 1991) when effectiveness is questioned no gender bias is observed. (Eagly, Karau & Makhijani, 1995) The tactics adopted remains same immaterial of the gender.

Qualification and Behavior (refer table 4), for a leader to be successful, knowledge about frequent problems, attribution biases (supply of resources, lawsuits, new regulations, bad weather and sabotage, corrective feedback, expressions towards desires, confidence level) all depends on qualification along with other aspects of Behavior and tactics, there are several works on leader attributions (Kipnis, Schmidt, Price, & Still, 1981; Mcfillen & New,1979, cited by Yulk, G, pg 232, leadership in organizations, 8th edition), situational conditions affecting development (Green, Anderson & Shivers, 1996), emotions & moods of both leaders & followers in recent years (Ashkanasy & Jordan, 2008; Bono, Foldes, Vinson, & Muros, 2007; Gooty, Connelly, Griffith, & Gupta,2010), but there are still little research on demographic elements of employees, job characteristics, work unit characteristics, type of organization (refer table 7), and in particular qualification.

Job title and Behavior (refer table 5), designation matter with the power or authority a person holds in the institution, attributions about subordinates and the leader's reaction are affected by leader's position power. (Kipnis, Schmidt, Price, & Still, 1981; McFillen & New, 1979, cited by Yulk, G, pg 232, leadership in organizations, 8th edition) few sources of the literature review on leadership, it is observed that leaders signify managers, in particular to job title. For example reaction of a manager to poor performance as a two-stage process, first stage to determine the cause of the poor performance and managers tries to select an appropriate response to correct the problem. Studies on managers considering them as leaders by several scholars (Martinko, Harvey, & Douglar, 2006; Tjosvold, 1985; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993, Orsburn, Moran, Musselwhite & Zenger, 1990; Wellins, Byham & Wilson, 1991).

Behavior depends on the department he works for (refer table 6), environment, campus, job profile, syllabus and practical's decides the job role of a leader, this study is supported by the Expectancy theory, this theory of motivation focuses on the factors that influence an individual's decision to exert effort on a task provided they feel that their efforts will be rewarded (Vroom, 1964; cited in Yukl, 2010). Behavior plays an important role in motivating and supporting to achieve desired outcomes (House, 1971; cited in Yukl, 2010).

Corporate experience and Behavior (refer table 8), corporate experience imply the educational leader approach as institutional approach stresses the involvement, considering the differences about the industrialisation (Gallie, 1978; Lane, 1989; Maurice et al., 1986), academic experience and Behavior (refer table 9), entail Behavior and working for different organizations fortify the relationship of a leader with institution, work, cultures and

timings, all these add to the knowledge hub as leadership significantly related to four personality factors: outgoingness, intelligence, emotional stability and assertiveness (Singh, 1978). Total number of years of experience and Behavior (refer table 10) and Number of years of experience in the present institution and Behavior (refer table 11) add to the outcome of behavior as experience cannot be explained, one needs to experience by self and experience counts, experienced academic leaders exhibit the vastness of exposure, are in better position in handling situations they come across, sometimes they may approach the faculty requesting for a help in the proposal by making them realise the importance of their help in their career and sometimes they may even take the help of the documents/evidence, rules, policies and regulations in successful completion of task.

Not only the roles of academic leaders and academic leaders affect the sustainment of quality faculty even the availability of resources in attainment of goals affect. 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). There is controversy in understanding the roles of leaders and managers, they are qualitatively and mutually exclusive, (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Zaleznik, 1977) management needs to realize and understand that academic leaders are concerned about how things get done and try to get people to agree about the most important things to be done. Bennis & Nanus, 1985 propose that managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right things". 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 academic leaders or academic leaders.

LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH:

The study is solely based on the data obtained from the respondents and limited to only three higher educational institutions. Two years of stay in the same institution was one of the criteria. Randomly, academic leaders were selected from each department of Engineering, MCA and from MBA institutions and the study is restricted to Bangalore alone covering only few colleges in Bangalore. Other courses can be considered for future research and can be continued to other parts of the country and countries.

CONCLUSION:

This article focused to study the linkages between higher authorities of technical institutions and demographic variable's (age, gender, qualification, job title, type of department, type of institution, numbers of years of corporate experience, number of years of academic experience, total number of years of experience and present institution experience) influence while recruiting, assigning task for positions involving promotions consider the demographic variables which have an bearing influence on appropriate behavior on effective engagement. Technical institutions, apart from technical requirements of their job, should therefore consider the specific demographic variables that have significant influence on institutions critical outcomes.

REFERENCES:

Abelson, P. H. (1997). Evolution of higher education. *Science*, 747.

Ansari, M. A., and Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 40, pp 39–49.

Ashkanasy NM and Jordan PJ (2008). A multi-level view of leadership and emotion. In: Humphrey RH (ed.) *Affect and Emotion: New Directions in Management Theory and Research. Charlotte,* NC: Information Age Publishing, 17–39

Bartol, K. M. (1978). The sex structure of organizations: A search for possible causes. *Academy of Management Review,* 3, 805-81

Bartol, K. M., Martin, D. C., & Kromkowski, J. A. (2003). Leadership and the glass ceiling: Gender and ethnic group influences on leader behaviors at middle and executive managerial levels. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies,* 8-19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/107179190300900303

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership Theory, Research and Managerial Applications* (4th ed.). Free press, New York.

Bennis, W. & Nanns, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies/or taking charge.* New York: Harper

Bono, J. E., Foldes, H. J., Vinson, G., and Muros, J. P. (2007). Workplace emotions: the role of supervision and leadership. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 92, 1357–1367.doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1357

Bostjancic, E. (2010). Personality, job satisfaction, and performance of Slovenian managers – how big is the role of emotional intelligence in this? *Studia Psychologica*, 52(3), 207-218

Cames, I., Vinnicombe, S., & Singh, V. (2001). Profile of "successful manager" held by male and female banking managers across Europe. *Women in Management Review,* 16(3), 108-118. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09649420110390273

Case, T, Dosier, L., Murkinson, G., & Keys, B. (1988). How managers influence superiors: A study of upward influence tactics. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal.* 9(4), 25-31.

Davis, M. H., Capobianco, S., & Kraus, L. A. (2010). Gender differences in responding to conflict in the workplace: evidence from a large sample of working adults. *Sex Roles,* 63, 500-514.

Dobbins, G.H., & Platz, S.J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *Academy of Management Review,* 11, 118-127

Dreher G.F., Dougherty T. W., Whitely W (1989). Influence tactics and salary attainment: A gender-specific analysis, *Sex Roles,* 20, pp 535-550

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233-256. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.233

Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., and Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin,* 117, pp 125–145.

Erez, M., & Rim, Y (1982). The relationship between goals, influence tactics, and personal and organizational variables. *Human Relations,* 35, 877-878.

Erez, M., Rim, Y, & Keider, I. (1986). The two sides of the tactics of influence: Agent vs. target. *Journal of Occupational Psychology,* 59, 25-39

Ferrario M., Davidson M.J. (1991). Gender and management style: A comparative study, [In:] M.I. Davidson and C.L. Cooper, (eds.), *Shattering the Glass Ceiling,* London: Paul Chapman

Füsun, C. A. (2010). Gender–based analysis of leadership differences in Turkey. *Euromed Journal of Business.*

Gallie, D. (1978). *In search of new working class.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Gardiner, M., & Tiggemann, M. (1999). Gender differences in leadership style, job stress and mental health in male and female dominated industries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 72(3), 301-15.

Gooty, J.; Connelly, S.; Griffith, J.; Gupta, A. (2010). Leadership, affect and emotions: A state of the science review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 2010, 979-1004

Green, S. G. & Mitchell, T. R. (1979). Attributional Processes of Leaders in Leader-Member.

Green, S. G., Anderson, S. E. & Shivers S. L. (1996). Demographic and organizational influences on leader-member exchange and related work attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 66, 203-214.

Groves, K. S. (2005). Gender differences in social and emotional skills and charismatic leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(3), 30-46.

Harvey, P., Martinko, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2006). Causal Reasoning in Dysfunctional Leader-Member Interactions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 21, 747-762

House, Robert J. (1996). Path-Goal Theory Of Leadership: Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7.3 (1996): 323-352

Ilgen, D. R., and Feldman, J. M. (1983). Performance appraisal: A process focus. In Staw, B. M., and Cummings, L. L. (eds.), *Research in organizational behavior,* JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp.141- 197.

Jamali, D., Sidani, Y., & Abu-Zaki, D. (2008). Emotional intelligence and management development implications: insights from the Lebanese context. *The Journal of Management Development,* 27, 348-360.

Jones, E. E. (1964). *Ingratiation.* New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Kaiser, R., Hogan, R., & Craig, S. (2008). Leadership and the Fate of Organizations. *American Psychologist,* 63, 96-100.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1978). *The social psychology of Organisation*s. New York: Wiley.

Katzenbach, J. R. and Smith, D.K. (1993). *The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-performance Organisation,* Harvard Business School, Boston

Kipnis, D. Schmidt, S. M. and Wilkinson, I (1980), Intraorganisational influence tactics: Exploration in getting one's way, *Journal of Applied psychology,* 65, pp 440- 452

Kipnis, Schmidt, Price, & Still, (1981). *McFillen & New, 1979,* pg 232, cited in Leadership in organizations, 8th edition of Gary Yukl

Lane, Ch. (1989). *Management and labor in Europe: The industrial enterprise in Germany,* Britain, and France.

London: Edward Elgar.

Lansford, M., Clements, V., Falzon, T., Aish, D., & Rogers, R. (2010). Essential leadership traits of female executives in the non-profit sector. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning,* 6, 51-62.

Martinko, M. J. & Gardner, W. L. (1987). The Leader/Member Attribution Process. *Academy of Management Review,* vol. 12, pp. 235-249

Maurice et al. (1986). *The social foundation of industrial power.* Cambridge/London: The MIT press.

Mitchell, T. R., Green, S. G., & Wood, R. E. (1981). An attributional leadership and the poor performing subordinate: Development and Validation. *Research in Organisation,* vol. 3 pp197-234, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

Mowday, R. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 23, pp 137-156.

O'Connor, K. (2010). *Gender and Women's Leadership: A reference hand book,* Sage Publicaitons, Inc.

Orsburn, J.D., Moran, L., Musselwhite, E. & Zenger, J.H. (1990). *Self-directed work teams: The new American challenge.* Homewood, Illinois: Business One Irwin.

Powell, G. N. (1990). One more time: Do female and male managers differ? *Academy of Management Executive,* 4(3), 68-75

Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (2003). Gender, gender identity, and aspirations to top management. *Women in Management Review,* 18, 88-96.

Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century.* Westport, CT: Praeger

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression management: The self- concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Schmidt, S. M., and Kipnis, D. (1984). Manager's pursuit of individual and organizational goals. *Human Relations,* 37, pp 781–794.

Singh, M. M. H. (1978). *A Study of Leadership Behavior of Secondary Schools of Haryana and Its' Correlates.* Ph. D. Education KU, Kurukshetra

Tedeschi, J. T. (Ed.), (1981). *Impression management theory and social psychological research.* New York: Academic Press.

Titus, O., & Gill, R. (2003). Gender differences and similarities in the leadership styles and behaviour of UK managers. *Women in Management Review,* 18, 288-298.

Tjosvold, D. (1985). Implications of Controversy Research for Management. *Journal of Management*, 11(3), 21–37.

Van Dick, R., Hirst, G., Grojean, M.W. and Wieseke, J. (2007). Relationships between leader and follower organizational identification and implications for follower attitudes and behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* Vol. 80 No. 1, pp. 133–150.

Vecchio, R.P. (2003). In search of gender advantage. *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 14 No. 6, pp. 835-50.

Wellins, R.S., Byham, W.C., & Wilson, J.M. (1991). *Empowered teams: Creating self-directed work groups that improve quality, productivity, and participation.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Wood, R. E. & Mitchell, T. R. (1981). Manager Behavior in a Social Context: The Impact of Impression Management on Attributions and Disciplinary Actions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* vol. 28, pp. 356-378

Yukl, G (2014). *Leadership in Organization, 8th edition,* Pearson publication, ISBN: 978-93-325-1813-1

Yukl, G., and Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 75, pp 132–140.

Yukl, G., and Tracey, B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss, *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 77, pp 525–535.

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.

Zaleznik, A. 1977. Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review* (May-June)