

**LEADERSHIP FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EMPOWERMENT**  
**(Presidential Address at AIAER Annual Conference 2010)**

**S. P. Malhotra**

Once Napoleon was standing before his band of 50000 soldiers and asked them if one is added to your number of fifty thousand what will be the total number. Stock came the reply 'fifty thousand one'. Napoleon retorted back 'No, it will be one lakh fifty thousand as Napoleon is added to your group of fifty thousand'. That is the leadership which needs to be offered to an institution. Large numbers of research studies have been conducted in the areas of leadership styles or leadership behaviour and they come out with a large number of the characteristics of leaders but research studies have not come with clear-cut role that an institutional leader should perform to lead an educational institution. It is in this context that I am going to analyze before you the leadership provided by a person to an institution that led the country in the area of discipline of Education.

What I am going to speak to you as presidential address is nothing but a case analysis of leadership given by a person to an institution to make it effective and empower its teachers. The analysis is about a well known institution of Education Centre of Advance Studies in Education, M.S. University Baroda when it was functioning under the leadership of Prof. M. B. Buch who headed the institution for only for five years (1972- 1977) and brought it on the map of India for its contribution in the field of research and innovations in Education. It can be compared with the superior leadership and focused strategy of Fred Terman who made Stanford University as entrepreneurial university in 1944. It may be mentioned here that Stanford as a private university did not have the access to State funding and was reeling under some resource crunch. Similarly was the case with the Department of Education in Faculty of Education and Psychology which was granted a special status as Center of Advanced Study in Education (CASE) by the University Grants Commission in 1963-64, initially for five years. The Expert Committee, appointed by the UGC for evaluation of CASE, was convinced that growth of CASE and fulfillment of its objectives were hampered due to lack of leadership. The Committee recommended to the UGC that the experiment be given a life provided the University appoints a full-time head for CASE, a professional with proven capability in institution building. The choice fell on Dr. Buch. He was invited to head the Center of Advanced Studies in Education. He took over CASE in 1969. With his leadership he could bring the institution on the map of India for its contribution to the discipline of Education. This write up is being written with the objective to analyse what made this institution so effective and how it could convince the persons working in the discipline of Education to recognize that there is an institution in India which is n effective institution of teacher education and is above board in the area of research in education. The whole phenomenological analysis is based on the sketch drawn by Mukhopadhaya (Mukhopadhyay 1988). It may be boldly mentioned here that work of Mukhopadhyay has been boldly used during analysis and at some places without putting the words under quotes.

**INSTITUTION BUILDING**

Institutions are built when the opportunities are created and the functionaries respond to these opportunities quickly. In spite of the fact that it was clear to him that he will be at the helm of affairs for five years only because he was to retire in 1977 but he operated as if he would be at CASE for a long haul. Buch's strategic plan involved decades because he prepared leadership in the faculty as well as the researchers who will hold the reigns of education system or education departments of the universities in India. His future plans were clear from his statement he made during farewell function of one of the colleagues that 'At CASE we do not prepare faculty for CASE, we prepare faculty/ leaders at CASE for the country. The more you spread around, the greater will be the spread of fragrance of CASE". To a question about his contribution he replied that his contribution was the development of researchers rather than research, development of discipline rather than institution. His main argument was that if he could

build a band of researchers or thinkers who could spread over to various universities and research institutions in the country, they would make much larger contribution over a longer period of time than what he could have done personally even if his research acumen was superior to anyone of them. His focus was evidently on the country, and on the education sector rather than on himself. Prof. Buch built up CASE with respect to five major aspects. These included perusing the vision, developing human resource, empowering the faculty, planned research process and Permanent contribution to discipline. He focused simultaneously on these five issues.

### **VISION FOR INSTITUTION**

The first was envisioning the future for CASE. He envisioned CASE as a 'national' center though located in Gujarat. Once there was a vision he meticulously built the replica of a cosmopolitan India in CASE with faculty, junior and senior research fellows and teacher fellows from different parts of India without compromising quality at any point. Once he found that the person was committed and qualified he will induct him/her into the faculty without consideration of other formalities. Terman at Stanford did the same when he could see expertise and excellence in one professor Stephen Timshenko for theoretical and applied Mechanics. He did not mind giving such a person steep rise from assistant professor to full professorship. His way of identifying talented bright young persons and bringing them together in CASE was unique. He would ask the professors in various universities, the researchers and the teacher fellows at CASE if they would know someone bright from their respective universities and encourage them to apply for the faculty or fellowship in CASE. He zealously guarded its cosmopolitan culture which was the core of success of CASE as an institution. At a time when all universities of Gujarat switched over to Gujarati medium and there was a move to introduce Gujarati as medium of instruction in M.S. University, he took the challenge and strategically put forward the case of CASE as rendezvous of bright young minds of the country as a pride of M.S. University and of the state. He succeeded. This was one of the many evidences of his risk taking behaviour and uncompromising position so far as quality in translating the goals of an institution is concerned. Indeed, one of the important attributes of an institution builder.

### **DEVELOPING HUMAN RESOURCE**

Dr. Buch was a human resource developer. He was not satisfied with just bringing in bright students together in CASE. He considered it his responsibility to ensure that they grow and matured as professionals. He adopted a few important strategies other than the normal enrollment of young research fellows as Ph. D students under one or the other guide. He focused on human resource development strategy with personal exposure of the young researchers to the outstanding scholars in education by attaching, even the junior most scholars to the dignitary invited to CASE all throughout his/ her visit. His objective was total exposure of a young budding professional to all dimensions of an accomplished professional. Indeed, an unconventional way of developing the younger lot. The meetings were not only to chat over tea but debate over the educational issues mainly addressing the nation at that particular time.

### **EMPOWERING THE FACULTY**

The faculty is empowered not by simply having the knowledge base but by putting the knowledge relevant to time and needs of the system. Terman in Stanford did it by introducing fields of study that could have better future such as electronics, biotechnology etc. Similarly Prof. Buch was very clear in his mind that future of teacher education lay in the innovations. He induced the faculty to follow innovations and the fields of study being taken up and studies at international level. For example the Programmed instructions movement started in 1960 and he asked the faculty to pursue the knowledge base in these fields. He induced the faculty to study hard and follow the trend of research by Flanders, Gage and others. He made the faculty in-charge of one of such programmes and expected that they come out with written material for the Indian students. He mounted such a pressure in the faculty that they did the same with in a year. In 1970 and 1972 there was good material for the Indian students in the areas of Programmed

learning, Micro-teaching etc. The faculty within a year reached at such a level that the universities in India were left with no alternate but to request CASE to help them with the expertise of the faculty. Along with such exposures, he always motivated the young scholars as well as the faculty to write on the educational issues. He often would advise and edit such writings. This provided the young scholars, the skills of writing and the confidence. Unlike the practices in the universities, he did not attach his name with such papers allowing the young scholars to get full credit for their works. Whenever he sought help of the scholars for a piece of work assigned to him and/ or undertaken by him, he never missed to include the names of the young scholars as co-authors so that the scholars might receive due credit for their contribution to the joint work. Dr. Buch never missed an opportunity of observing the professional aspects of the behaviour of the research fellows and giving feed-back. He would often call a first year entrant and encourage him to ask question. As much as, it was also not unusual to experience Dr. Buch censoring questioning behaviour of a senior. For him, it was not just the cognitive aspect or the quality of the question or the comment, but also the way it is put in a seminar. In other words, he emphasized not only what to ask but also how to ask.

### **PLANNED RESEARCH PROCESS**

The expertise of the faculty was further nourished by planned research. The Center selected a few areas of research in consultation with the experts at the national level, and also on the basis of the international trends of research those days. Each area was scanned extensively to identify the research problems that could collectively provide understanding in and wisdom about Indian education. The three areas selected were-programmed instruction, teaching and teacher behaviour, and innovation and management of change. He, however, did not restrict research in other areas by the faculty depending upon their specialization and inclination. As a result, research on motivation became another major field of research. The first research output in Programmed instructions was available from Baroda in 1969. From then on, there was no looking back. Within a couple of years, a large number of experiments were conducted using programmed learning material at various levels of education. Similarly, following the trend of research by Flanders, Gage and others, research on teaching took off fast. Beginning with studies on teacher effectiveness, the research studies moved on to experiments in teacher programming including micro-teaching, instructional strategies, etc. The studies on innovation and change started diving deep into the otherwise complicated process of how the individuals and organizations responded to the initiative on adoption of innovation. Eventually, such studies also explored the various innovations carried out in schools and colleges in the country. The planned research with the identification of the three major areas had to be backed up by the right kind of resources. His major organizational strategy was to involve a senior professional as leader in each area; and gather around him/her a group of bright young researchers. Although he took personal interest in all the areas, he organized research activities in programmed instruction, teaching and teacher behaviour and management of innovations around one senior professional each. He made special efforts and recruited new staff to lead these areas. He brought them from various universities and institutions in India. He pioneered interdisciplinary research in education. When the UGC Evaluation Team visited CASE for the second time, he had one person each from psychology, sociology and education carrying out research in innovation and change. He organized weekly seminars where both faculty as well as the students made presentations. The debates on different aspects of research used to last for three to four hours at a stretch. This weekly exercise was supplemented by seminars presented, at regular intervals, by senior professionals from all over the country. Eminent academicians from the national institutions as well as from various universities made presentations and participated in such seminars. These professional exposures were so exciting and taken so seriously by the faculty as well as young scholars that the discussion often split over into the "tea club" that was more than an interactive classroom on educational research. It was clear indication of his mission that conditions should be created where there is continual interaction among all the persons in an institution be it formal, informal, organized or unorganized.

## **PERMANENT CONTRIBUTION TO DISCIPLINE**

Dr. Buch was clear that the institutions are known for their contribution to the discipline. He struggled to make a permanent contribution to Indian educational research. He could diagnose lack of documentation and dissemination of educational research as the major limitation and constraint for Indian researchers. He knew it was a difficult task to undertake. Even his colleagues in education at national and international discouraged him and warned him about the difficulties in achieving his objective. But it fitted in well with his philosophy “every crisis is pregnant with an opportunity ...” He decided to undertake the first survey of research in education. With considerable difficulty, he was able to obtain only about Rs. 20,000/- from Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR). In 1972, within this amount, he was able to manage collection of abstracts of research carried out between 1943 and 1972 from every nook and corner of the country. These were classified into certain areas. Trends of research were analyzed and reported and the book, *Survey of Research in Education*, was published in 1974. Here too, he involved faculty, young researchers with senior professionals in the country to write the trend report. Indeed, a rare opportunity for young professionals to contribute to a national volume. He drove the faculty and researchers to a sense of urgency in doing the task and continually urges them that delay of even one day will be passed over the present and may never then regain the existing position. Dr. Buch completed -the massive four surveys of research in education from 1943-88 that have now become almost the ‘Bible’ for every young researcher. It is these well calculated multi-pronged planned strategies that made the Center of Advanced Studies in Education, an institution to reckon with not only within the country but also internationally within a short span of time. Buying co-operation was a phenomenon that he always carried out while getting the things done. The episode that occurred during the undergoing project throws ample light on his character as an institution builder. In the absence of any secretary and any identified project team, the survey work was being looked after by two young research scholars right from the beginning. Once all the abstracts were classified and trend reports started arriving, he inducted two other persons replacing the first two from the centre stage. They felt bad. Dr. Buch clarified that the project of this large magnitude and complication required different kind of skills in different phases of the project; he did not discriminate against anyone but involved two sets of persons with the two different sets of capabilities that were necessary for timely and successful completion of the project. In sum and substance it can be pointed out that Dr. Buch’s approach and concerns were for education and the persons who steer education. His success is that he has left behind him a band of educational professionals empowered with deep sense of commitment to discipline of education, good knowledge base and well trained for creative thinking. Many of them now occupy strategic positions in the national and international organizations, thereby shaping the policies and programs of the country.

## **LESSONS TO BE LEARNT**

Following lessons need to be learnt for making the institution effective and faculty quite empowered: Disciplines grow by the continuous efforts of the persons pursuing knowledge. Dr. Buch used to say that those who cannot think twenty four hours in education do not have the right to be in the discipline of education. The continuous thinking makes the issues prominent for the persons and they come out with innovative ideas to help disciplines grow. Having excellent faculty is necessary but not sufficient to make an institution effective. Leadership is equally essential for developing an institution. There is always a need to provide the faculty promising opportunities and taking care of organizational barriers, incentives, attitudes and policies. Leadership is not linked with the duration of stay in any institution. Leadership is a characteristic linked with individuals’ personality and devotion to work and mission to achieve. Faculty becomes empowered when the challenges, opportunities and interactive sessions are provided to them. The pressure to think makes the faculty members work and think and come up with good knowledge-base. Adopting the timely changes in the research fields makes the knowledge base grow. Simply having expertise in one field stops the thinking faculties of mind. In the disciplines like education the specialties should continuous change and interaction with world community helps in this direction. Continuous interaction (formal/informal, organized/ unorganized helps the faculty members to gain knowledge and

come out of the ego of linking to their own ideology. Listening to others makes faculty broad minded and amending their position on various issues.

In the thinking process there is never a hierarchy of maturity or non-maturity. Everybody can think and come out with innovations. Creativity is not birth right of elders or position holders in the university faculty. At no point quality of faculty needs to be compromised. Cosmopolitan nature of the faculty makes the institutions stronger and all grow with the system. It is not the financial resource that matters but how the human resource is used to meet the needs or mission of the institution is more important. Dr. Buch was provided with a meager sum to carry out the documentation of Indian researches and he could achieve his mission by appropriately utilizing the human resource.

### **CONCLUSION**

The present phenomenological study points out that the leadership makes the institutions strong and effective and empowerment comes with continuous hard work and thinking. Leaders make the faculty empowered to an extent that the real leader may live or not but leaders created by him continue to lead the discipline and the social order.

### **REFERENCE**

Mukhopadhyay, M. (1998) Dr. Madhubhai B. Buch: The human resource developer. In Buch, P. M. & Jyotsna, P. D. (Eds.) *Contemporary Thoughts on Education Commemorative Volume*, SERD, Vadodara.