

Influence Matters: Leader Influence Behaviours of Primary School Heads in Zimbabwe

Inbanathan Naicker¹, Vitallis Chikoko² and Shepherd Shoko³

^{1,2,3}*School of Education, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Private Bag X03, Ashwood, 3605, South Africa*

E-mail: ¹<Naickeri1@ukzn.ac.za>, ²<Chikokov@ukzn.ac.za>, ³<Shepherd.shoko@gmail.com>³

KEYWORDS Inspirational Appeal. Rational Persuasion. Sharing Responsibility

ABSTRACT Poor leadership and management among some school heads in Zimbabwe has been foregrounded as a cause for concern. Questions are being raised about school heads' ability to influence teachers in their day-to-day practice. Hence, this qualitative ethnographic study with a focus on leader influence behaviours employed by school heads to motivate teachers to attain school goals. Two schools were purposively sampled and at each school the school head and five teachers were selected as participants. Data was generated using interviews and participant observation. The study found that school heads utilised a variety of influence behaviours in the different core areas of their work. A blend, instead of the use of just one influence behaviour at a time increased the chances of a positive outcome. The researchers concluded that to be a good leader a school head ought to deploy a cocktail of leader influence behaviours that is context dependent.

INTRODUCTION

The Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training (CIET) (popularly known as the Nziramasanga Commission) raised concerns about the quality of leadership at schools in Zimbabwe. The CIET questioned whether the structures and cultures within which school heads (also known as school principals in some contexts) worked and through which they were appointed and trained were adequate (Chiome 2011). The under preparedness of school heads for the significant task of school leadership was emphasised in a study by Rhodes et al. (2009) who highlighted that many school heads had only two days of training before they were thrust into school leadership. The CIET, after a careful analysis of the challenges facing the education sector, concluded that school heads in Zimbabwe did not rise to the demands of their roles of being visionary leaders with appropriate skills, competences, professional education and atti-

tudes that are needed to influence educators and education outcomes to the satisfaction of the nation. This view was also vigorously supported by the media in Zimbabwe (Gore 2012; Share 2013). The CIET, having noted that school heads were the key role players in transforming and influencing educational outcomes, recommended that various training programmes for school heads be rolled out. These programmes included the Commonwealth Secretariat training and support programme for school heads in Africa (COMSEC), the Better Schools Programme of Zimbabwe (BSPZ), the Zimbabwe Open University (ZOU) and also the Africa University degree programmes (Chiome 2011). These initiatives bear testimony to the concerted attempts to improve school leadership in Zimbabwe. Given the attempts to develop and nurture school leadership, the focus of this paper is therefore on how school heads are using their leadership skills to influence teachers into buying into the vision of the school.

A survey of the corpus of literature on leadership reveals that leadership theory and research has of late been locked into the 'what' of leadership. In other words, it seems to provide very descriptive accounts of what leaders do. Very little attention has been paid to the how and why of leadership (Pillay 2015). In support of this Sampson (2012: 2) posits that "for leadership theory and research to be more useful to practising leaders it must provide guidance not

Address for correspondence

Dr. Inbanathan Naicker
Educational Leadership and Management,
School of Education,
Office G313, Main Tutorial Block,
Cnr Richmond and Mariannhill Roads,
Edgewood Campus,
University of KwaZulu-Natal,
South Africa
Telephone: +27 (0)31 260 3461
E-mail: Naickeri1@ukzn.ac.za

just about what an effective leader does but also about how he or she does it.” Sampson (2012) therefore is making a cogent case for how leadership is operationalised or practised. Hence the focus of this paper on how school heads influence teachers and how teachers respond to the influence behaviours of school heads.

Since this paper draws heavily on the concept of leadership, an unpacking of the concept and its use in the article is explicated upon. Leadership is complex and cannot be pinned down by any one definition (Forde 2010). It is a “shifting signifier” (Giroux 1992: 51) and therefore must be constantly discovered and rediscovered (Lalla 2013). One perspective of leadership focuses on the use of power to effect attitude or behavioural change (Pierro et al. 2013). It is viewed as a process where one person influences individuals and group members towards goal setting and goal achievement (Botha 2013). Another perspective views leadership as “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives” (Yukl 2010: 8). Borrowing from these definitions, leadership in this paper refers to the influence by one person (the school head) on an individual or group in order to attain an organisation's vision. Closely related to the concept leadership is the term management. Management is a set of processes that keep an organisation functioning through routine maintenance of day-to-day work operations and problem solving if results do not go according to plan (Myers 2012; Ratcliffe 2013). It “is a set of activities directed towards efficient and effective utilisation of organisational resources in order to achieve organisational goals” (Sapre 2002: 102). Management is the function of the leader concerned with efficiently performing agreed functions aimed at achieving set organisational goals by maintaining and carrying out certain day-to-day organisational functions.

This paper commences by making explicit the objectives of the study and explicating briefly on leadership influence behaviours. An account on the research methodology is then provided. The findings are thereafter presented under categories generated from an inductive analysis of the data. Analytical interpretation and discussion of the data is injected into the findings. The researchers conclude by presenting their learn-

ing's about leadership influence behaviours and the impact it has on teachers.

Objectives of the Study

This paper firstly, seeks to explore how school heads influence teachers in their (school heads) day-to-day leadership practice and secondly, determine how teachers respond to school heads' leader influence behaviours.

Leader Influence Behaviours

In this paper the researchers earlier pointed out that leadership may be understood as ‘influence’. However, the researchers did not unpack the actions or behaviours that should be sought by leaders who want to be effective influencers in their organisations. Influence behaviours refer specifically to behaviours used intentionally to influence the attitudes and actions of another person (Von Dohlen 2012). It refers to leader behaviours designed to change member behaviour or attitudes (Lee and Salleh 2008). In this paper, the term refers to specific leader actions viewed at a molecular level, to change behaviours and attitudes of the followership. Seminal studies on leader influence behaviours was conducted by Kipnis et al. (1980). They developed the Profiles of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS) comprising a leader self-report questionnaire which gave rise to the first set of six leader influence behaviours of assertiveness, coalitions, exchange, ingratiation, rationality and upward appeal (Lee and Salleh 2009; Yukl 2010; Lian and Tui 2012).

Yukl and his colleagues extended the work of Kipnis et al. (1980) by identifying additional behaviours of inspirational appeal, consultation, legitimating, pressure and personal appeal to bring the total number of identified influence behaviours to eleven where they still stand today (Lee and Salleh 2009; Yukl 2010; Lian and Tui 2012). Inspirational appeal and consultation were rated as most effective and pressure, coalition and legitimating behaviours were found to be the least effective in securing task commitment or compliance in corporate organisations. In later studies by the same authors it was found that rational persuasion, consultation, collaboration, and inspirational appeal were the most effective in gaining followers commitment. These

four behaviours have subsequently been termed core behaviours (Yukl 2010).

METHODOLOGY

This paper is couched within the interpretive paradigm whose belief is that there are multiple realities which are contingent upon human practices (Dillow 2009). Accordingly, the researchers took into account how school heads and teachers' behaviours and experiences construct realities which are inherently subjective and unique to each individual school setting and time. This study observes an ethnographic design. Ethnography is the art and science of exploring and describing a social group, culture, subculture or cultural scene, which includes the daily lives, routines, behaviours, values, beliefs, norms, dress, language, artefacts and attitudes that create a describable pattern in the lives of groups of people, communities or organizations (Gulati et al. 2011). Ethnographers indulge in particular data generation methods which are aligned to their methodological frames (Myers 2008; Gulati et al. 2011). Accordingly, the researchers chose unstructured conversational interviews, semi-structured interviews and participant observation. Ethnography's use of these multiple methods to generate data helped the researchers to counteract biases that could emanate from the use of a single method (Robson 2011).

Ethnographic research places emphasis on people as the instruments of data generation (Newman 2006; Delamont 2008). In line with this, the researchers were the primary data generation instruments in this study. Purposive sampling was used. Purposive sampling taps data from information rich participants (Cohen et al. 2011). A sample of two high performing substantive school heads from a population of forty school heads, and five teachers from each school were purposively selected for this study. Simultaneous to the data generation the data was analysed. Data analysis was thus an on-going process done at the end of each day of fieldwork and at the end of the research process (Prane 2009). The researchers worked with the data, organising them, breaking them into manageable units, coding and categorising them, synthesising them and searched for patterns. Throughout the research process ethical proto-

cols such as anonymity, beneficence and non-maleficence were observed (Rule and John 2011). Therefore in reporting on the data, *nom de plumes* are used in order to protect the identity of the schools and participants.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

While noting that there are a number of leader influence behaviours (Lee and Salleh 2009; Yukl 2010; Lian and Tui 2012) in this paper, the researchers report on the four leader influence behaviours namely, rational persuasion, consultation, sharing responsibility and inspirational appeal because these were the most frequently used leader influence behaviours by the school heads.

Rational Persuasion Leader Influence Behaviours

Rational persuasion occurs when school heads influence teacher behaviours by explaining issues and then providing supporting evidence to back the claims made (Yukl et al. 2008; Yukl 2010; Lepsinger 2013). An extensive use of rational persuasion was observed in the area of school financial resource management during the data generation process. In the two schools, financial management was a collective effort involving the school development committee's finance committee and a finance sub-committee comprising teachers representing the various departments in the school. The school head sits in both committees and is responsible for allocating financial resources made available by the joint finance committees for teachers to use.

At Glow Primary School sustained observations revealed that school finance meetings were attended by some school development committee (SDC) members and teachers in the finance committee. Two such meetings were observed. At the meetings Mr Sheik, the school head, used most of his time providing persuasive explanations and evidence using finance books, receipts and calculations to support any proposal he made in the meetings. This was meant to highlight the perceived culture of transparency in how finances were handled in the school. In a semi-structured interview Mr Sheik was asked how financial resources were allocated in the school and his response confirmed the observations when he said, "We normally sit down in

a finance committee and discuss given requests.” Because membership of the finance committee was diverse in terms of representation and big in terms of membership numbers one needed good persuasive skills to have proposals presented at the committee meet with success. This is where Mr Sheik had an edge over others. In all meetings observed, apart from the power of explanation, Mr Sheik capitalised on consultation (another leader influence behaviour) and his access to certain information which he used to support his arguments. This excluded other members from the realm of expertise and left them in a position of less influence to challenge Mr Sheik’s arguments. Horwitz (2013:1) professes that to achieve this as a leader, before the consultation process, “do your homework [and] get the facts.” Probably that was why Mr Sheik always influenced decisions about financial resource allocations in his favour.

The Myrna Primary School head, Mr Chinos, also influenced financial resource allocation in his school by using logical arguments and factual evidence to show that a request he was making to the housing committee was feasible and relevant. For example, after reporting a problem with teachers’ houses to the housing committee, he took senior teachers and the SDC to the houses that needed repair so that they could have a look at what he meant before a financial decision about the issue could be taken. Both the teachers and the school committee members agreed that money be set aside to repair the houses. In semi-structured interviews some teachers, for example Mrs Tari concurred that Mr Chinos influenced members by painstakingly explaining issues in finance meetings. She said, “He calls a meeting and explains to the finance committee and sub-committee (made of teachers and SDC members) what he thinks is important to the school at that particular time.” How some teachers responded to the outcome of such meetings (where Mr Chinos explained ‘what he thinks’ is important to the school at that particular time.) was alluded to by Mrs Tari in the same interview when she said, “I realise that some departments get their things bought ahead of others, I don’t know.” Perhaps she did not see fairness and transparency (which are believed to be the culture of the school) in how financial resources were being allocated. The, “I don’t know,” may suggest that she had little information about how financial decisions were arrived

at. Mr Huni a teacher at the school was even more critical. He complained saying that, “It’s necessary for teachers to know how much money is available ... however, such announcements at times are done to block us from making certain financial requests like what happened today about sports.” Mr Chinos had announced to pupils and indirectly to teachers at assembly that the school needed \$500 for sports but the school account had only \$100. Mr Chinos made the announcement knowing that the sports committee was drafting a budget for the same event it was going to submit to him that morning. This could suggest that though Mr Chinos could be trusted, it’s possible he used his positional power as the school head to make financial decisions, at times using manipulative persuasion or not genuinely consulting teachers. To be effective, however, Yukl and Michel (n.d.) warn that for consultation to be effective the follower must trust that the influencer is not being manipulative, and that the follower must trust that the leader is sincere about improving the proposal or plan rather than pursuing a personal agenda.

What stood out at the two schools was that school heads seldom used rational persuasion as a standalone influence behaviour (Yukl 2010; Lepsinger 2013). During the influence process they used a blend of rational persuasion and consultation behaviours in meetings to a large extent. They used rational logic and consulted teachers to influence them. Using rational persuasion concurrently with consultation not only enhances chances of successfully influencing teachers but can also increase the quality of that outcome as well (Lepsinger 2013). Lahtero and Risku (2013) reminds leaders of the mediating effect of cultural artefacts (language) to influence others. They emphasise that when the school head uses the verbal cultural artefacts (power of language during consultation and persuasion) in leadership, the language he or she uses does not operate only as a tool to communicate but it also affects teachers’ ways to understand the reality of their school organisation and culture.

Schools Heads’ Use of Consultation Leader Influence Behaviours

While consultation influence behaviours were used in almost all areas of the school head’s work, its most pronounced use was in the area

of human resource deployment. In the data generation the focus was more on the sensitive area of how classes were allocated to teachers. The researchers wanted to know how school heads influenced teacher behaviours in the way they allocated human resources in their schools because from the researchers experience it is the area of teacher allocations that poses challenges to school heads.

At Glow Primary School, instead of closing everyone else out and doing teacher class allocations unilaterally the school head, Mr Sheik purported that he, “may discuss allocations here and there but class allocations rests with the head.” In an interview with teachers, the majority of them, for example Mr Soko concurred that “sometimes he [the school head] can call you and consult but at times he just does it alone.” He said on many occasions some teachers had rejected classes allocated to them leading to misunderstandings. We see this approach as breeding mistrust as teachers would feel that they are unfairly treated since some are consulted and some are not. Mistrust will decrease trust in the school head by teachers and has the potential to increase dissatisfaction with the school head (Mayer et al. 2011).

On the same subject of class allocation, consultation was even broadened at Myrna Primary School. This is what Mr Chinos, the school head had to say on how he did teacher class allocations. “Well over the years I haven’t met with resistance unless if it is hidden resistance.” On further probing he said:

Where there are reservations the issue is brought to the attention of the deputy head... As we move towards the end of the year, we give members a chance to decide which classes to take into the next year. Whilst we have our own tentative allocations based on supervision of teachers and also pupils’ work, we move on to consult.

On how the final allocation of classes was done he said, “It will be based on consensus with staff members. Whilst we ask and they may give diverging views we still have to sit down and agree.” What Mr Chinos said was echoed by most teachers in their responses in a semi-structured interview. A typical response from the teachers is what Mr Fuma of Myrna school said, “At times the head sends a circular for teachers to propose grades they want to teach and can perform at their best level ... then the head starts

from there.” Mr Chinos involved all teachers giving them a sense of personal obligation and teachers said they welcomed their new classes.

A cross analysis of the two schools revealed that meetings were held at all schools in an effort to involve everyone in decision-making. However, teachers at Myrna Primary School felt there was no genuine consultation because decision-making was usually dominated by the management team. It was also noted that a smaller number of people (management team) was closely consulted by the Glow Primary School head while at Myrna Primary School Primary School there was a tendency to consult as many teachers as possible on class allocations. Bush (2011) sees this way of managing, where all are involved as resonating with what he called pure collegiality where everyone is given voice. This is because collegiality sees it as ethical and wholly appropriate to involve people in the decisions that affect their professional lives. The idea of involving all teachers in leadership decisions is also the bedrock of distributed leadership. Its core assumption is that each member has some leadership capability that is needed by the group at one time or the other (Harris 2008). This then could be the justification for widely consulting like what was observed at the three schools as a way of enriching school leadership with this untapped reserve of leadership talent in teachers. Wide consultation can be seen as good practice. Foucault (2002) sees good leadership practice as a situation where certain actions modify others. This suggests that ideas should be allowed to come from all teachers and school heads since good practice is born out of the interaction of their ideas.

Schools Heads’ Use of Sharing Responsibility Leader Influence Behaviours

Sharing responsibility is about handing over responsibility for decision-making to a group (Sampson 2012). When a school head shares responsibility to influence teachers s/he encourages teachers to make self-directed decisions in an area they would have been asked to lead. At Glow Primary School, the responsibility for implementing various school policies was shared among the numerous committees that existed in the school for example the procurement committee, the school improvement committee (SIC), the basic education assistance module (BEAM)

committee, prize giving committee and the finance committee. This approach is a way of distributing leadership among all teachers in the school in a collegial environment (Bush 2011). When success accrued to the school, Mr Sheik the school head, would share it with his whole staff. This was observed when the prize giving committee gave a report back about a very successful prize giving day they organised in the school. After the report back the school head said, "Have you heard the good work the prize giving committee is doing for our school? Who can best thank them for us?" The sports organiser and another teacher volunteered to thank the committee. This demonstrates how powerful sharing power with others, like what Mr Sheik was doing here, can be at influencing teacher behaviours.

On policy implementation issues school head, Mr Sheik was asked how the policy on running school examinations was being implemented in the school. He explained:

In fact we used to have the deputy head organising and managing exams and tests in the whole school. We realised that it did not work and we sat and discussed and we came up with this issue of departments running their own things.

What made these departments and committees work in an extra ordinary way was the degree of autonomy that they had. Mr Sheik relinquished his power and trust to these departments and committees making them feel that they are valuable to the attainment of the school's leadership outcomes. A similar approach was used by school head Thomson of Glencoe School (pseudonyms) who gave teachers considerable autonomy over issues of instruction and curriculum, in a study carried out by Murphy et al. (2009) and the results were remarkably similar. Mr Sheik also recounted in a conversational interview that committees and departments in the school, "need not hesitate to make decisions about issues that their committees must deal with." Confirming the existence of a culture of sharing leadership responsibility, the majority of teachers interviewed about policy implementation concurred with what Mr Nkomo purported when he said, "All teachers will want to see that the agreed policy is implemented by actively participating in its implementation." The responsibility to lead policy implementation according to Mr Nkomo was shared among and

led by all teachers in the school despite position in the school hierarchy.

The school head Mr Sheik was asked what the responses of teachers were to his approach of using committees and departments headed by specialist teachers to implement policies in the school was. His response was:

Maybe there might be some who do not like what we do and are quiet about it but from what I have observed it's well received by teachers. I see them actively participating and to me this means that the way we do things is accepted and liked by the teachers.

In a semi-structured interview teachers were asked how they responded to the school head's idea of sharing leadership responsibility with them. Because they are involved, Mrs Dewa said, "All teachers will want to see that agreed policy is implemented." As such they personally commit themselves to the implementation of school policies and support each other. Mr Celo said the school head, "sometimes singles out teachers and praises them for their achievements ... and we do not want to let him (school head) down. Instead we want to do even better." By sharing leadership responsibilities with teachers Mr Sheik influenced teachers' trust and commitment to organizational outcomes resulting in teachers working even harder in order to succeed in areas they lead. Burton and Peachy (2013) claim that trust created by a leader can facilitate an open climate, build a helping culture, and is associated with organizational citizenship behaviours.

Observations were also done at Myrna Primary School with regards to how policies were implemented and what the role of the school head was with regard to the role of committees and individuals in the leadership process. Focus was firstly on how the teacher supervision policy was implemented in the school. At Myrna Primary School it was observed that ordinary teachers in the form of supervision teams participated in teacher supervision and they had their own timetables and programmes. For example two senior teachers were seen observing a lesson of another teacher and discussing the lesson afterwards. This aligns with Bush's (2011) collegial management claims that in schools practising collegiality, teachers talk about teaching and learning and the presence of peer supervisors is common in the classrooms. This has the potential of enhancing professionalism and good practice in the school. This is because

teachers are more likely to feel psychologically safe enough to speak out with new ideas in such work environments (Tu and Lu 2012). Observations were also done at a bereavement committee meeting. It was organised and held in the afternoon when Mr Chinos had left the school for town. In a conversational interview a teacher was asked what the school head will say if he heard that they had organised and held a meeting during his absence and she replied, "The head will be happy. He likes committees that do their work without a push from the administration." This suggested that committees in the school had a lot of autonomy in the way they worked and it was because Mr Chinos encouraged this. Teachers' intrinsic motivation is heightened when they have a high level of autonomy in their work situation, which provides them with enhanced freedom and discretion to schedule work as they see fit (Murphy et al. 2009; Piccolo et al. 2010; Ma and Cheng 2013). There was a disciplinary committee in the school. It was responsible for maintaining pupil discipline and it worked closely with the school head. Because the school was relatively big, individual teachers were invited to share the responsibility of leading in maintaining pupil discipline in the school. For example, at an after assembly caucus briefing, observations revealed Mr Chinos addressing teachers on pupil discipline and he said, "The head and disciplinary committee alone cannot instil discipline in pupils ... Pupil discipline is our responsibility. It begins with me, it begins with you. Where ever you are see to it that you play your part fully." Mr Chinos was inviting all teachers to work as one team leading in implementing the school's disciplinary policy owing to his readiness to share leadership responsibility. Shared leadership has been described as a positive enabler for improved organisational performance (McCauley-Smith et al. 2013).

How did Myrna Primary School teachers respond to this scenario where everyone was perceived to be a leader? Observations showed how teachers responded to the school head's call for teachers to show leadership in maintaining pupils' discipline. On that day teachers promised to get more involved. Three days later it was observed that four senior teachers seated under a classroom veranda attending to a case of a pupil accused of stealing his class teacher's pens. Normally teachers send misbehaving pu-

pils to the school head's office. However looking at the number of committees that were in the school and the number of teachers in each committee, the questions arises as to who is not a leader in this school? This question was answered by Mr Soko in a semi-structured interview when we were discussing the school's policy on selecting leaders to lead extracurricular activities in the school. He said, "There is no one who is not a leader because you are expected to have an area where you lead."

Mr Chinos was asked how teachers responded to his approach of sharing leadership responsibilities with them. He said in the event that there is a leadership challenge, "They will take the problem as their own problem which needs a collective solution." Sharing leadership responsibility influenced teachers' perceptions of leadership and leadership challenges in ways that promoted oneness among teachers and the school leadership team (Good 2011). In a semi-structured interview, Mrs Moyo of Myrna school said she will not perform at her best if she works at a school where leadership responsibilities are not shared and the school head and his core leadership team (deputy head and Teacher in charge) lead alone. She said this, "makes you feel like you are nobody at a place." Her response suggests that teachers who share leadership responsibility with the school head feel less alienated and identify with the school head and his leadership team more. Widening the network of leaders in the school like what happened at Myrna strengthens leadership and improves practice by eliminating contradiction and friction by making almost all the teachers leaders in one area or the other (Crawford 2012).

A cross-analysis of what was happening at the two schools shows that there were many similarities in how school heads influenced teacher behaviours by sharing leadership responsibilities. For example they all made use of departments and committees to lead policy implementation. What however differed was the degree of involvement. The Glow school head relinquished some of his power to the committees and departments which were autonomous in the way they made decisions. This is in line with Gunter's (2005) characterisation of distributed leadership called authorised distributed leadership. Authorised distributed leadership is where work is distributed from the principal to others within a hierarchical system of relations.

This type of leadership can also be termed ‘delegated leadership’ (Gunter 2005) and is evident where there are teams, informal work groups and committees as was observed at both Glow Primary School. While leadership responsibility was shared among the various committees at Glow Primary School, the Myrna Primary School head extended this to include all teachers in his school; trying to release the leader in everyone. What obtained at Myrna can be characterised as dispersed distributed leadership where much of the workings of an organisation take place without the formal working of a hierarchy (Gunter 2005). Dispersed distributed leadership is a more autonomous and is accepted because of the knowledge, skills and personal attributes of organisational members who work as individuals or in autonomous work groups (Gunter 2005; Manetje and Martins 2009; Crawford 2012). The Myrna school head recognised the expertise of his teachers and let go some leadership responsibilities to these teachers who then worked with a lot of autonomy. From a collegial and distributed leadership perspective schools thrive if leadership is shared (Spillane et al. 2011; Von Dohlen 2012) like what was happening at these three schools. From a distributed leadership perspective, because leadership outcomes are shared, if something fails, the whole team shares the responsibility rather than just one person. This adds a feeling of protection in the group and gives people more incentive to contribute to the group for its common good. When the group succeeds everyone shares in the glory rather than the leader getting the sole credit for everyone else’s work (Good 2011). As to why those with power (the two school heads) will want to share the responsibility of exercising it with their subordinates, collegial models purport that members measure their contribution in terms of the climate of participation, the level of influence they can have on decisions and the processes of involvement (Bush 2011).

Schools Heads’ Use of Inspirational Appeal Leader Influence Behaviours

With inspirational appeal the leader makes an emotional request or proposal that arouses enthusiasm by appealing to followers’ values, ideals and beliefs. The leader also influences behaviour by increasing followers’ confidence that they can successfully accomplish a task

(Yukl 2010; Lepsinger 2013). The researchers’ turned their attention to teacher development and sought to understand leader influence behaviours school heads used in this area. Teacher development issues have to do with teacher enrichment and further training initiatives like staff development programmes, coaching clinics, mentoring courses and even organised degree programmes teachers can undergo to improve their work performance (Bubb and Earley 2011).

From semi-structured interviews held with the school head and teachers, the teachers at Glow received no monetary or other incentive for running staff development sessions in their school. Mr Sheik associated staff development with issues teachers liked and valued to influence teachers and keep staff development sessions alive. On this issue he commented that, “If topics are relevant and there is a real need and also if they own the sessions they will like staff development sessions.” He also aroused teacher enthusiasm by appealing to their values and beliefs. We learn this from a comment Mrs Dewa of Glow School gave about how Mr Sheik influenced them to participate in staff development:

The head makes us feel good about doing staff development by passing very positive comments after each session and encouraging us to keep on researching. He says, ‘what you are doing is the right thing and I can see we are benefiting a lot from the sessions.

Mr Sheik’s comments appealed to teachers’ professional values and positive emotions and were successful in keeping them going despite the absence of any extrinsic incentive. During observations at the school teachers were seen organising and conducting these staff development sessions with no push from the school head. This observation is supported by Swaffield (2011:1058) who observes that teacher development programmes can “become ritualised and mechanistic if simply ‘doing’ is divorced from thinking about the underlying principles.” The key message here is that teacher development practices and beliefs need to be developed together, something which we saw was akin to what Mr Sheik was doing here.

On the same issue of influencing teachers to participate in staff development this is what the Myrna school head, Mr Chinos had to say:

We haven’t been able to give them monetary incentives due to the current economic hard-

ships we are facing as a country; however I also encourage them to further their studies like this current scenario where we have this Teacher Capacity Development Programme. Teachers here like to learn. Quite a number of our members have shown interest.

Mr Chinos knew that his teachers valued further studies and he appealed to this value to keep teacher development alive in his school. What Mr Chinos did and said corroborates what Mrs Moyo of Myrna said on the same issue that, "There are no incentives for our participation ... Staff development does not die here because people know and see its importance."

Looking at responses to leaders' inspirational appeal behaviours at the two schools, one can tell that teachers responded in a similar way. It seems inspirational appeal behaviours transformed and aroused commitment in teachers. Teachers responded by committing themselves to work agendas and worked hard to achieve desired work outcomes. This is in line with Yukl et al.'s (1996) finding that inspirational appeal is an effective tool for raising subordinates enthusiasm and commitment towards set goals. This may be a good example of using power in a positive way as espoused by Foucault (1975). He said power can either be used positively or negatively. Power, which is influence in action is seen by (Foucault 2002) as a way in which certain actions modify others. This agrees with Spillane's (2006) view. Rather than viewing leadership practice as a product of a leader's knowledge and skill, Foucault (2002) and the distributed perspective of Spillane (2006) sees it as the interactions between people and their situation. In their interactions with teachers, the school heads were able to successfully influence teacher behaviours through inspirational appeals towards strong commitment to work objectives. Like collegial models which discourage reliance on authority and force (Bush 2011; Hasanvand et al. 2013) distributed leadership espouses influence as appropriate for altering behaviours (Bush 2008; Corigan 2012; Hasanvand et al. 2013).

CONCLUSION

What we learnt from this study is that strong inspirational appeal and contrived consultation leader influence behaviours were most likely to result in or be interpreted by teachers with mis-

trust, lack of transparency and authoritativeness because teachers felt that they excluded free debate and critical thinking on matters of concern to them. This greatly reduced school heads' success at influencing teachers owing to the *resistance* it generated. Rational persuasion influence behaviours were more likely to secure *compliance*. The more school heads exhibited attributes of being knowledgeable and credible the more teachers were likely to believe in their influence attempts. The main reason for complying in most instances is because of teachers being unsure or being unknowledgeable in the area of concern. Further, *commitment* occurred when consultation, inspirational appeal, rational persuasion and sharing responsibility were perceived to be genuine by teachers based on transparency, integrity, collaboration, culture of trust, and recognition of effort by the school heads. From this we conclude that to be a good leader who can positively influence others, a school head ought to initiate and nourish the aforementioned leader influence behaviours, cultures and values in their schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In this paper the outcomes of the simultaneous use of a combination of leader influence behaviours and the contextual issues identified by this study was not fully explored. Whilst the researchers recommend that school heads should try to blend leader influence behaviours for optimum results, further research into specific combinations is still required. In engaging in such research, employing different methodological approaches such as narrative inquiry or phenomenology may lead to a more nuanced understanding of how a combination of leader influence behaviours work in influencing followers.

REFERENCES

- Botha R 2013. Epistemological beliefs and leadership approaches among South African school principals. *Educational Studies*, 39(4): 431-443.
- Bubb S, Earley P 2011. Ensuring staff development impacts on learning. In: T Townsend, J MacBeath (Eds.): *International Handbook of Leadership for Learning*. Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London, New York: Springer, pp. 795-816.
- Burton L, Welty Peachey J 2013. The call for servant leadership in intercollegiate athletics. *Quest*, 65(3): 354-371.
- Bush T 2011. *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management*. 4th Edition. London: Sage.

- Chiome C 2011. Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from Zimbabwe. In: T Townsend, J MacBeath (Eds.): *International Handbook of Leadership for Learning*. Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London, New York: Springer, pp. 445-465.
- Cohen L, Manion L, Morrison K 2011. *Research Methods in Education*. 7th Edition. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training (CIET) 1999. *Zimbabwe: Report of the Presidential Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training*. Harare: Government of Zimbabwe.
- Corrigan J 2013. Distributed leadership: Rhetoric or reality? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(1): 66-71.
- Crawford M 2012. Solo and distributed leadership definitions and dilemmas. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(5): 610-620.
- Delamont S 2009. The only honest thing: Autoethnography, reflexivity and small crises in fieldwork. *Ethnography and Education*, 4(1): 51-63.
- Dillow C 2009. Growing up: A journey toward theoretical understanding. *Qualitative Enquiry Journal*, 15: 1338-1351. DOI: 10.1177/1077800409339581.
- Forde RD 2010. *Minds and Hearts: Exploring the Teacher's Role as a Leader of Pupils in a Class*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Foucault M 1975. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault M 2002. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Giroux H 1992. *Border Crossings. Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Good D 2011. 5 Reasons Why Servant Leadership Works. From <<http://technorati.com/business/gurus/article/5-reasons-why-servant-leadership-works/>> (Retrieved on 12 November 2013).
- Gore M 2012. School Heads Sleep on the Job. The Herald. From <<http://www.herald.co.zw>> (Retrieved on 14 December 2012).
- Gulati S, Paterson M, Medves J, Luce-Kapler R 2011. Reflection on the methodological aspects of a critical ethnographic approach used to inform change for adolescents with disabilities. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(2): 523-562.
- Gunter H 2005. *Leading Teachers*. London: Continuum.
- Harris A 2008. Distributed leadership: According to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46: 172-188.
- Hasanvand MM, Zeinabadi HR, Shomami MA 2013. The study of relationship between distributed leadership and principals' self-efficacy in high schools of Iran. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 3(2): 92-100.
- Horwitz R 2013. 9 Ways to Influence Without Authority. People Talk. From <<http://HRVoice.org>> (Retrieved on 15 November 2015).
- Kipnis D, Schmidt SM, Wilkinson I 1980. Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(3): 440-452.
- Lahtero TJ, Risku M 2012. Symbolic leadership and leadership culture in one unified comprehensive school in Finland. *School Leadership & Management*, 32(5): 523-535.
- Lalla S 2013. *Women Middle Managers in Schools: Narratives about Capabilities*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Lee KL, Salleh ALH 2009. Examining the determinants and outcomes of superior downward influence tactics: the mediating impact of role ambiguity and subordinates' competence level. *International Business Research*, 1(3): 67-81.
- Lepsinger R 2013. *Four Ways Effective Leaders Gain the Commitment of Others*. Houston: Small Business Network.
- Lian LK, Tui LG 2012. The mediating effect of downward influence tactics on the relationship between leadership style and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal Pengurusan*, 36: 3-16.
- Ma Y, Cheng W 2013. Linking ethical leadership to employee creativity: Knowledge sharing and self-efficacy as mediators. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 41(9): 1409-1420.
- Manetje O, Martins N 2009. The relationship between organisational culture and organisational commitment. *Southern African Business Review*, 13(1): 87-111.
- Mayer RC, Bobko P, Davis JH, Gavin MB 2011. The effects of changing power and influence tactics on trust in the supervisor: A longitudinal field study. *Journal of Trust Research*, 1(2): 177-201. DOI: 10.1080/21515581.2011.603512.
- McCauley-Smith C, Williams SJ, Gillon AC, Braganza A 2013. Making sense of leadership development: Developing a community of education leaders. *Studies in Higher Education*, (1): 37-41. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2013.842209
- Murphy J, Smylie M, Mayrowetz D, Louis KS 2009. The role of the principal in fostering the development of distributed leadership. *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 29(2):181-214. DOI: 10.1080/136324309 0277 5699
- Myers S 2012. Definitions of Leadership and Management. From <<http://www.teamtechnology.co.uk/leadership/management/definitions-of-leadership-and-management>> (Retrieved on 15 August 2013).
- Neuman WL 2006. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 6th Edition. Boston: Pearson International.
- Piccolo RF, Greenbaum R, den Hartog DN, Folger R 2010. The relationship between ethical leadership and core job characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31: 259-278.
- Pierro A, Raven BH, Amato C, Bélanger JJ 2013. Bases of social power, leadership styles, and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(6): 1122-1134.
- Pillay S 2015. *Leading Successfully Against the Odds in Highly Functional Disadvantaged Schools*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Pranee L 2009. *Qualitative Data Analysis: Conceptual and Practical Considerations Qualitative Road Map*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ratcliffe R 2013. What is the Difference Between Leadership and Management? From <<http://oas:the>

- guardian.com/5c/careers> (Retrieved on 8 July 2013).
- Rhodes C, Brundrett M, Nevill A 2009. Just the ticket? The National Professional Qualification and the transition to headship in the East Midlands of England. *Educational Review*, 61(4): 449-468.
- Robson C 2011. *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*. 3rd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rule P, John V 2011. *Your Guide to Case Study Research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Sampson S 2012. *Influence Tactics and Leader Effectiveness: How Effective Contemporary Leaders Influence Subordinates*. Queensland: Queensland University of Technology.
- Sapre P 2002. Realizing the Potential of Education Management in India. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 30(1): 101-108.
- Share F 2013. Acting Heads Manning 80% of Zimbabwean Schools. The Herald. From <<http://www.herald.co.zw>> (Retrieved on 18 April 2013).
- Spillane JP 2006. *Distributed Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spillane JP, Healey K, Parise LM, Kenney A 2011. A distributed perspective on learning leadership. In: J Robertson, H Timperley (Eds.): *Leadership and Learning*. London: Sage, pp. 159-171.
- Swaffield S 2011. Leading assessment for learning. In: T Townsend, J MacBeath (Eds.): *International Handbook of Leadership for Learning*. Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London, New York: Springer, pp.1047-1065.
- Tu Y, Lu X 2012. How ethical leadership influence employees' innovative work behavior: A perspective of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9: 1-15.
- Von Dohlen HB 2012. Teacher leadership behaviors and proactive influence tactics in North Carolina public schools. *Organization Management Journal*, 8(4): 229-241.
- Yukl G 2010. *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl G, Michel JW (n.d.). Proactive influence tactics and leader member exchange. In: CA Schriesheim, LL Neider (Eds.): *Power and Influence in Organizations: New Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, pp. 87-103.
- Yukl G, Kim H, Falbe CM 1996. Antecedents of influence outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3): 309-317.
- Yukl G, Seifert CF, Chavez C 2008. Validation of the extended influence behavior questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5): 609-621.

Paper received for publication on May 2016

Paper accepted for publication on October 2016