CHAPTER - IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The main aim of study was to investigate the contribution and achievements of Robson Moses towards the promotion of Physical Education and sports in the country and also the professional leadership qualities of Robson Moses. Thus the data collected as per the design elaborated in the procedure chapter and were subjected to analytical and interpretive analysis.

The findings are presented in three sections:

Section one: deals with biographical aspect of Robson Moses which includes his family background, educational background, professional qualifications, professional career, views to improve professional preparation in India, sports achievements, awards and distinctions as a coach, as a sports promoter, important coaching assignments, as a teacher, as an administrator, as a scholar, as an organizer, contribution in the development of sports infrastructures,
professional associations, published work, his views on Physical Education in India, his views for the upliftment for the sports in India, views on the various sports promoting schemes in India, his likings and dislikings and lastly his massage to upcoming Physical Educationists of India.

**Section two:** deals with the views of the following eminent Indian physical educationists:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arjuna Adwardee – Dr. Ajmer Singh</td>
<td>Chandigarh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professor T.S. Brar</td>
<td>U.S.A. (New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dritt Holder – Dr. Arun Kumar Uppal</td>
<td>Dhaka Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dr. A.M. Moorthy</td>
<td>Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dr. Indu Mazumdar</td>
<td>Gwalior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Madhya Pradesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dr. Dilip Dhuriya</td>
<td>Varanasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uttar Pradesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mr. C.V. Rao</td>
<td>Gwalior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Madhya Pradesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dr. Ramesh Pal</td>
<td>Gwalior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Madhya Pradesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dr. A.K. Datta</td>
<td>Gwalior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Madhya Pradesh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dr. Rajendra Singh</td>
<td>Gwalior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Madhya Pradesh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section three: deals with the opinion rating survey of Robson Moses that covered the following dimensions:

1. Robson’s Personality.
2. Robson as an Administrator
3. Robson as a Scholar.
4. Robson as a Teacher.

SECTION ONE

FAMILY BACKGROUND ROBSON MOSES:

Robson Moses affectionately called Roby was born on August 4, 1924, in IRENEPURAM, a small town in Kanya Kumari District, one of the most beautiful Districts of Tamil Nadu at the Southern tip of the country, with low mountains range, thick lush green forests, stretches of rubber plantations, shady coconut trees, green paddy fields and three sides turquoise seas with white sandy beaches having moderate rainfalls and subtropical climate.
Robson was born to Rev. G.N. Moses and Mrs. Joyee Moses and was the fifth child in the family among five sons and two daughters.

Robson got married in the year 1956, with Miss Jasmine, who belongs to Marudur Kurichi in Kanya Kumari district but at the time of marriage she was in Quiloin in Kerala State.

**SIBLINGS OF ROBSON MOSES:**

Robson was one amongst the five brothers and two sisters.

His eldest sister, Mrs. Florence. G. Abraham, first lady to receive Master's degree in Zoology by research in Tamil Nadu who worked in the Department of Fisheries as Assistant Director, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

Her husband late Mr. J.G. Abharam who was the Chief Engineer in P.W.D. in Tamil Nadu.
His first eldest brother late Mr. M.M. Nathaniel was a brilliant scholar with B.sc honours in physics and was ranked as major in army and after his retirement joined Railways as Chief Personnel Officer.

His second eldest brother Mr. M. Wilson. Anuraj worked as specialist of textile chemistry in Mumbai.

His third eldest brother Dr. M. Theodore Sundar was Medical Practitioner in Thirunalveli (Tamil Nadu).

Then Robson himself.

His younger sister late Mrs. Padma Justus was M.Sc. in Zoology and worked as Head Mistress.

His youngest brother Dr. Godwin Joseph is retired Chief Engineer from C.P.W.D.

Robson and Mrs. Jasmine Robson have 3 children.
Eldest Son Dr. Amrit Kumar Moses is Working as Lecturer at Y.M.C.A. College of Physical Education Saidepet, Chennai.

Second daughter Mrs. Joy Presillapremadhiban is a lecturer in English in Women’s Christian College, Nagar Coil, Tamil Nadu.

Third daughter Mrs. Sushela Sundar Singh in married to a businessman and settled in Chennai.

His wife Mrs. Jasmine Moses is also highly educated M.A., B.Ed., B.Lib. and worked as Head Mistress in a Girls School at Palathur and she is also a winner of State Best Teacher Award for her services in the field of education.

Mr. Robson and Mrs. Jasmine Robson have six grand childrens as:

- Two sons for eldest son.
- One son and a daughter for first daughter.
- Two sons for second daughter.
Eldest son-in-law Mr. Prem Adhipan is a lecturer in DIET (District Institute of Educational Training) in Therur. After getting his M.A. and M. Phil degrees in Mathematics, he is now undergoing Ph.D. in the same subject.

Younger son in law Mr. Raja Sunder Singh is managing director of the Eagle Security press, Chennai.

**EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF ROBSON MOSES:**

Robson had his elementary education from LMS (London Missionary School) at Marthandam in Kanya Kumari district. After 4th standard he joined SMV (SRI MOOLA VILASAM) English High School, Vanchiyur, Trivandrum.

In those days elementary classes were till 4th standard

First Form - 5th Standard.
Second Form - 6th Standard.
Third Form - 7th Standard
Fourth Form - 8th Standard.
Fifth Form - 9th Standard.
Sixth Form - Which was equivalent to present 10th Standard.
The SMV English high school was very big school located in Travancore (now Kerala), which was predominantly a Malyalam speaking state. Most of the boys and girls have Malayalam as their mother tongue and in one section there were a few boys having Tamil as their second language, first language being English. The medium of instruction was purely English and he studied in the “G” Section as there were 7 to 8 sections and Tamil Section was “G”.

After passing the 10th Class, he joined the Scott Christian College Nagar Coil, which was a Junior College at that time and from there he passed the Intermediate Examination with first division having Physics, Chemistry and Maths as subjects. After this he joined the University College of Trivandrum for his B.A. Degree Course. After graduation he joined Y.M.C.A. College of Physical Education Saidepet, Chennai for the Diploma in Physical Education with 12 students besides about 90 students for the certificate course. During that time he had the opportunity to join Police Force as Assistant Superintendent of Police by
direct recruitment in 1946. But he did not report for the final selection, as he wanted to serve the profession of Physical Education for following reasons:

(a) He liked the profession of Physical Education very much.

(b) His mother did not want him to join police force.

(c) Principal of Y.M.C.A. College of Physical Education, Madras, Mr. Cody. S. Moffet also advised Robson not to leave the profession as he had a chance to go to U.S.A. for higher education and had a bright future in the profession that inspired and motivated Robson to continue the profession.

In the year 1954, when he was working as the Director of Physical Education at Algappa College of Physical Education, Karai Kudi, he went to Spring Field College U.S.A. for his Masters Degree in Physical Education on being granted a Full bright scholarship. In the year 1972 he again received a Full bright scholarship and went to University of Oregon for his Doctoral Degree in Physical Education. He was generously granted a study leave with
half-pay on both the occasions by Dr. Algappa Chettair Educational Trust.

He had a burning desire to study at Spring Field College, USA, and the birthplace of Basketball. His dream got realised in the year 1954 when he left for Spring Field College, USA for Master's Degree.

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF ROBSON MOSES:

His first professional qualification was the Diploma in Physical Education, which was the highest qualification in Physical Education available in India at that time from Y.M.C.A. College of Physical Education, Chennai, he scored second rank with first division.

In the year 1954 he went to Spring Field College U.S.A. for his Master's Degree.

In the 1972, he again went to the University of Oregon for his Doctoral Degree.
PROFESSIONAL CAREER OF ROBSON MOSES:

42 years of professional career of Robson is a shining example of dedication and discipline. Before he completed his Diploma in Physical Education from Y.M.C.A. College of Physical Education, he had many invitations for appointment as Director of Physical Education. After completing his Masters degree he returned to India in 1955. In a function of Algappa College, Dr. Algappa Chittair announced that the people usually start colleges and then search for principals but in this case, Robson is available and we are starting a college of Physical Education with him as the principal. He worked there from 1956 to 1976.

In the year 1976, he was invited by SNIPES (Society of National Institutes of Physical Education and Sports) to take charge of the Lakshmi Bai National Institute of Physical Education, Gwalior as Principal. He joined duty as Principal LNCPE in August, 1976.

After his retirement from LNCPE, Gwalior in the year 1984, he was invited by Annamallai University and
appointed as the Professor, Head of the Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences and worked till 1988.

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF ROBSON MOSES:

On asking him about in professional preparation he thinks that he had a very good professional preparation.

First he worked as the Director of Physical Education in Algappa Arts College, where lot of emphasis was given to the physical activities. In those days, he participated with the students in the various activities that prepared him very well to execute his duties.

When he went to Spring Field College U.S.A. for his Masters degree, he opted many professional courses applied to professional preparation of Physical Education, which upgraded his knowledge to contribute a lot to teacher education in India.
ROBSON'S VIEWS ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION IN INDIA AND WESTERN
COUNTRIES:

Their programme of professional preparation is very very thorough starting from under graduate level even from their high school level probably. Recruitment of professional students is also very careful and an intensive process. One cannot get admission in any professional courses in Physical Education by walking in the college campus. One ought to have adequate practical standards in the games, sports and also good knowledge about them. Every thing as a practical and theoretical aspect in fully tested before admission is given. They have four year under graduate course before getting the Bachelor's degree in the field of Physical Education. During the course the students have to take theory and practical courses at beginner, intermediate and advance level. For each activity there used to be three graded courses and a student had to pass from one to another. In theory subjects all the related Scientific subjects as Anatomy, Physiology are taught together. A student had
to first opt Anatomy and then Physiology and all courses were intensive.

The students of Spring Field College had a deeper knowledge than their counterparts in India.

**ROBSON’S VIEWS TO IMPROVE THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION IN INDIA:**

He replied that he is not very much satisfied with the professional preparation of Physical Education in India. There should be thorough scientific knowledge in many areas for the Physical Education Teacher. For instance, any outstanding player who has won International laurels when asked who is your coach? He will always reply Physical Education Teacher i.e. who teaches the skills with great interest to the students and they are motivated to participate in the games and sports with enthusiasm thus, they achieve milestones. Hence, professional preparation of the Physical Education Teacher should involve certain amount of the preparation to be the coach. Changes take
place quite fast but curriculum does not change fast enough probably for this. Some steps have to be taken.

- Some subjects have to be dropped.
- Subjects have to be amalgamated with others.
- Semester system have to be introduced.

He personally believes that the professional students should adopt scientific approach for teaching and learning situation and when they come to Masters level they should be more and more motivated and oriented to do research outside. Research may not only be conducted in labs but may be held on the field so that they may have a deeper insight in the problems of Physical Education and can solve them by collecting and analysing data and by statistical technique. He feels that there should be more fieldwork given to the professional students as a part of professional training. There should be shorter periods of three months refresher course or a special diploma so that they are able to upgrade their knowledge in the profession. Professional preparation has to be made broad based, more scientific and also more job oriented. All Physical Educators shall not
desire of working in schools and colleges but also to go for the self-employment. This is one such area where Physical Educators have failed miserably. Physical Education Teachers should be able to develop a lot of self-employment opportunities for themselves, as experts in fitness and Physical Educators shall also work as physiotherapist to rehabilitate sportsmen as well as the handicapped. There should be some sort of coordination and cooperation with medical and paramedical courses. He opined that Physical Educators should have liaison with medical personnel for chocking out excellent schedule for patients. He stressed that Physical Educators should be provided opportunities to acquire Diploma in physiotherapy and rehabilitation in order to enhance the scope of self-employment. This should be done because our philosophy should not only confine to prepare Physical Education Teachers for schools and colleges but should be more than that as:

- Service to Nation.
- Service to the Society.
Physical Educators should be able to look after the old age homes, orphanages, and handicapped, organize programmes for deaf and dumps etc. Physical Education Teachers should be involved in Nehru Yuva Kendras, community centers, clubs, adventure programmes as well as tribal areas so that they may be able not only develop fitness but also teach certain activities which may have any carry over value. Further, develop fitness but Physical Education Teachers may be given specialised training in yovic practices, so that they may have an additional avenue for seeking a job or to launch yovic centers.

**ROBSON MOSES AS A COACH:**

While responding to this question Robson replied "I coach Basketball team from 1947-1956". He coached Algappa college of Physical Education Basketball team and they achieved success in Inter-Collegiate tournaments and many of his students represented University games in Basketball. He used to provide coaching to selected students during morning and evening hours. Beside
Basketball he used to provide necessary programme for enhancement of physical fitness among the masses.

**ROBSON’S CONTRIBUTION FOR THE PROMOTION OF SPORTS IN INDIA:**

He believes that sports and the games are the part and parcel of the Physical Education and every Physical Education Teacher must take part in them. At Algappa college of Physical Education he organized numerous state level basketball, football, volleyball and lawn tennis tournaments. He also organized All India Interuniversity at Karaikudi. After joining LNCPE as DEAN he successfully organised and conducted All India University Athletics Competition. This competition was held for the first time at LNCPE, Gwalior. He also extended his help for military and paramilitary tournaments. He was also actively involved in organising various tournaments throughout his life. Along with this he was also invited to the various organising committees and sub-committees to preside over. Recently he had a project under him called “VISION 2020” means how to develop the District Nagar Coil as a very good district with
the help of natural resources so that it can be top in Tamil Nadu State. In this there was a separate section for the sports too. He completed his report and submitted to organising Secretary and his work was appreciated a lot.

**ROBSON’S CONTRIBUTION IN DEVELOPING SPORTS INFRASTRUCTURES:**

He had contributed a lot in developing sports infrastructure wherever he worked as Director, Principal, Professor and Head etc.

1- When he was working in Algappa Arts and Science College, Karaikudi he developed:

- One Football Field
- Two Lawn Tennis Courts
- A Indoor Badminton Hall
- Basketball Court
- A Weight Training Hall

The play fields developed by Robson Moses at Algappa Arts and Science College, Karaikudi have been depicted in Picture-1.
PICTURE - 1  SPORTS FACILITIES DEVELOPED BY ROBSON MOSES AT ALGAPPA ARTS AND SCIENCE COLLEGE, KARAIKUDI, TAMIL NADU
2. When he was working as Principal at Algappa College of Physical Education he developed:

- Two Basketball Courts
- A Running Track
- Hockey Ground
- Two Volleyball Courts.

Many facilities were developed by the grant released to the college by the University Grant Commission. A small stadium of track and field named “UMAYAL STADIUM” was also build during his tenure at Algappa College of Physical Education.

The play fields developed by Robson Moses at Algappa College Physical Education, Karaikudi have been depicted in Picture –2.

The Research Lab developed by Robson Moses at Algappa College of Physical Education, Karaikudi have been depicted in Picture – 3 respectively.
ALAGAPPA COLLEGE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION
UMAYAL STADIUM
DECLARED OPEN BY
THIRU K. A. MATHIAZHAGAN, B.A.,
(MINISTER OF FINANCE, GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU)
ON JANUARY 6, 1970.

THIRU M. RAMA RAO, TMT. UMAYAL RAMANATHAN,
ENGINEER, CORRESPONDENT.
THIRU AR. THANGAVELU, DR. M. ROBSON,
CONTRACTOR, PRINCIPAL.

PICTURE – 2 SPORTS FACILITIES DEVELOPED BY ROBSON MOSES AT ALGAPPA COLLEGE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, KARAIKUDI, TAMIL NADU
PICTURE – 3 RESEARCH LAB DEVELOPED BY ROBSON MOSES AT ALGAPPA COLLEGE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, KARAIKUDI, TAMIL NADU
When he joined Department of Physical Education and Health Sciences in Annamallai University there also he was very much active in developing the sports infrastructures such as :-

- Two Basket-ball Courts
- Indoor Badminton Hall
- Gymnasium
- Four Lawn Tennis Courts
- Running Track
- Two Volleyball Courts.

The play fields developed by Robson Moses at Annamallai University Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences have been depicted in Picture -4.

Robson Moses also developed a Book Bank and a library at Annamallai University Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences have been depicted in Picture-5 respectively.
PICTURE - 4 THE SPORTS FACILITIES DEVELOPED BY ROBSON MOSES AT ANNAMALLAI UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH SCIENCES
PICTURE - 5 BOOK BANK AND LIBRARY DEVELOPED BY ROBSON MOSES AT ANNAMALLAI UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH SCIENCES
ROBSON'S CONTRIBUTION IN DEVELOPING THE VARIOUS FACILITIES:

When the joined LNCPE Gwalior as Principal many facilities already existed but he still thought to construct a separate hostel for postgraduate students, M.Phil Scholars, Ph.D. Scholars. The hostel was also used to accommodate the officials for the various intervarsity tournaments and also to accommodate the delegates for the seminars.

He also build a separate guest house and a Research block, which in now named after him as "Dr. Robson Complex" at LNIPE, Gwalior.

During his tenure library grant was increased to develop a new book bank.

The facilities developed by Robson Moses at L.N.C.P.E., Gwalior have been depicted in Picture- 6.
Picture 6 - RESEARCH LAB, PSYCHOLOGICAL LAB AND SEPRATE LIBRARY RESEARCH DIVISION DEVELOPED BY ROBSON MOSES AT LNCPE, GWALIOR.
Establishment of National Resource and Documentation Centre (NRDC).

The Head Quarter for the National Physical Fitness Programme was also developed at LNCPE, Gwalior.

Extension Services were started during his tenure with the main purpose of introducing Physical Education and sports for the tribal youth in the state and it was very widely accepted by the Government of India and also by the Madhya Pradesh Government.

ROBSON'S SPORTS CAREER

While responding to this question he told that he doesn't think that he had participated in many of the games and sports to win laurels but he participated for the sake of enjoyment. He used to play Basketball for his school and that to with barefoot, ring was fixed in a coconut tree and used football in place of basketball and without a coach. He also represented the school team in football. He was also good player of Ball Badminton, Track and Field was his favourite
sport in which he brought many laurels in event 800 Mts. and 1500 Mts. for the year 1945, 1946, 1947, he represented college Basketball team also. Mr. C.C. Abraham who was alumni of Spring Field College U.S.A. was his coach and under his guidance he won many laurels for his college. He also said that Robson is not an International player but is a real Physical Educator.

**ROBSON’S VIEWS ON THE DETERIORATING SPORTS PERFORMANCES IN INDIA:**

He told, “Standards are not deteriorating”. No, certainly the profession of the Physical Education and sports in coming up, the records are broken but this is only the regret that rate of progress in very-very slow for this the reason may be:

- Academic load is too high in schools.
- As a nation we do not believe in sports.
- Parents do not want their wards to participate in sports.
- Our attitude towards the sports is negative.
- We are more incline towards the studies.
- Our nutritional level is low.
- Poor economic status.
- By philosophy we do not meet the needs of our body.
- We are more spiritualists.
- Ascetic.
- Sacrificing the body for only comfort.
- Negative attitude towards competitions.
- Involvement of Politics.
- More Emphasis on Academics.

All these factors act as a hindrance to excel in sports. The standards are improving but slowly and steadily. He said that "Chalta Hai" attitude is responsible for slow progress in term of achievement in sports. Further, the slow progress in sports in due to democracy where things move quite slow.

ROBSON’S VIEWS ON VARIOUS SCHEMES FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE SPORT:

Various schemes by the Government of India have been useful to certain extent but still funds that are allotted
for the schemes are spent at organisational level only. A very low percentage of funds reach to sportsmen. For e.g. The Sports hostel scheme for the students is a very good idea to attract boys and girls together in the hostel who have achieved certain amount of success in sports and games. Ultimately the amount sanctioned by the State Government or the Central Government for the boarding expenses of the students is inadequate. The good sportsman are from the middle class family who decline to join the hostel because they are not attracted by the facilities, accommodation and boarding. These schemes are still functional and lot things have to be done. Other schemes, as NATIONAL SPORTS TALENT CONTEST is also operational. NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAMME was very good but review committee recommended its abolition because it was similar to any other athletic meet. He still thinks that it is one of the best programme to promote the Physical Education in India especially to school going population. Nehru Yuva Kendras served a useful purpose in promoting cultural and sports activities among the people but it is difficult to know that how far it is
successful. The State Associations, National Associations have fairly good ideas about the players and the athletes in the states and they are in touch with the District associations. The District coaches have also good idea about players and as such there should be no problem in searching and finding out talents but due to high academic load they are unable to spend their much of the time in the play grounds and as they are more concern about percentages so that they can get admission in the medicals and other professional courses. Hence they spend their morning and evening hours for attending tuitions rather than sports. Unless their problems are solved we cannot expect many youngsters coming to play grounds.

**ROBSON’S VIEW ON UPCOMING OR MUSHROOMING COLLEGES OF PHYSICAL EDUCATIONS IN INDIA:**

His views are very specific. He discussed many time at the Government level but is unsure that whether the short duration courses may be of one year. Many states offer only one-year courses in the field of Physical Education. The State Government in giving recognition to many of these
colleges which run such courses that were started many years ago and as a result of which they had made lot of money. Some of them earned money and invested in the colleges to develop the facilities and infrastructures. Some of the colleges have become good institutes but many others are functioning on the commercial basis. He is totally against commercial colleges and said that they should be strictly supervised and checked. A curriculum that is prescribed by the University Grant Commission and Government of India should be implemented. Mushrooming of such colleges without proper facilities should be completely stopped.

ROBSON’S EXPERIENCES AS ORGANISOR - WORKSHOP, SEMINARS, CONFERENCES:

It is very difficult for him to remember the number of seminars, clinics, conferences and workshops he had organised during his career. One thing when these all were organised he was there as a Head of faculty who stimulated, guided and coordinated the programmes. He played a key role towards sanctioning of required finance. He was always
there as the Head of the Department but the key person who organised the programme was always the senior member of the faculty assisted by a Sub-Committee that normally included the faculty members and some scholars too. He had a professional satisfaction that he was able to organise the several programmes for uplifting Physical Education. The Silver Jubilee Celebrations was organised at LNCPE, Gwalior in the year 1982, where the Governor of the Madhya Pradesh was the Chief Guest. When he was at Allappa College of Physical Education (ACPE), Karai Kudi he got the citation from Basketball Federation of India which recognized his services for successfully organizing the Basketball tournament.

**PUBLISHED MATERIALS:**

He has written no book as such but his first publication was the Thesis format for the professional students at Algappa College of Physical Education, Karai Kudi. A similar manual was published at LNCPE, Gwalior in associated with Dr. Arun Kumar Uppal. He had written number of articles but have no records hundreds of them
were published in various Journals. LNCPE, Gwalior used to publish Journal of sports sciences in which the research articles were published. Robson Moses was the chairman of the same. He also assigned various projects to the research assistants in Universities. The research assistants and senior staff member who worked under him published number of articles. He had no book to his credit due to the lack of time from administrative work and now he does not have any reference material to write any book and he find it difficult to write any book alone with his memory.

**VARIOUS ASSOCIATIONS TO WHICH ROBSON MOSES WAS ASSOCIATED:**

1- A member of the ALL INDIA COUNCIL OF SPORTS (AICS).

2- A member of SOCIETY FOR NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS (SNIPES).

3- President Of Indian Association Of Teachers Of Health, Physical Education And Recreation (Iathper).

4- President Of All India Associations Of Colleges Of Physical Education (Aiacpe).
5- Member Board Of Governors Of International Council Of Health, Physical Education And Recreation (Icthper) New York.

6- Director, National Physical Fitness Programme.

7- Was UNESCO and ICHPER expert from the Asia for Physical Education.

8- Acted as an expert member of the Academic Bodies and Special Committees of many Universities.

9- Was a special member of the committees of University Grant Commission / All India Universities / National Council Of Educational Research And Training / Centre Board For Secondary Education And Ministry Of Education, Government Of India.

10- Member, Dr. Algappa Chettair Educational Trust, Chennai.

11- Member of Pensioners Association.

12- Chairman of the Board of Management of LNIPE, Gwalior in an honorary capacity.

13- Patron of many Professional Association.

A copy of vita of Robson Moses is give in Appendix - 4.
ROBSON MOSES VIEWS HOW TO MAKE PHYSICAL EDUCATION ATTRACTIVE: -

His views are very specific:

* Physical Education has to be required subject right from the school level.
* Adequate play fields must be provided.
* Covering all the teaching arenas and Gymnasium with latest facilities.

Every child should be exposed to the physical activity, games and sports, so that participation in the sports may became a habit. At present, there is a tremendous academic load on the child and other subject teachers take even the Physical Education periods away. Physical Education teachers are given other duty that is likely to lower the status of Physical Education. If our country has to thrive in next 20 years then our country has to give sufficient emphasis to Physical Education so that the health of school going children may be positively affected. With the numerous elementary schools coming and making Physical
Education compulsory there will be a huge demand for Physical Education Teachers. Every school must have playgrounds of their own and every school should have at least one Physical Education Teacher.

Therefore the sports and the games are to be made necessary requirement at the school in order to broaden the base and by the time they reach higher level the sportsman may exhibit superior performance. He opined that Physical Education programme should start early, timely spotting the talents and nurture the talents in order to reach higher in sports performance.

ROBSON’S VIEWS ON SCIENTIFIC PHYSICAL EDUCATION:

There are two things in this connection:

1- Basically he is a physical education man.

2- From Physical Education only the sports has to develop.
He believes that Physical Education is foundation or the base for the strong and high performance sports. Now Physical Education has to start from very early stage even from the elementary school where children are taught various skills. Unless the skill is developed at the beginning it will not be possible to learn at the later stage. He means even walking, running, throwing, holding and passing. All the fundamental basic skills involved in the sports should be taught scientifically. Further, adequate emphasis must be laid on the development of physical fitness so that performance in various games and sports may improve. He basically believes that Physical Education and sports must be the part of required programme for all school children that has to be taught scientifically. A Physical Educator must have the ability to analyze so that a child may become skillful in the sense that he may perform a movement efficiently by spending less energy. At present we have got the Physical Education lecturers, professors and Physical Education scientists who are involved in more and more research. Physical Education is must for all from the point
that the healthy people will constitute a healthy nation and weak people will become a liability.

Today we live in a competitive world where there is a cutthroat competition. He believes that winning shall not be the sole motto but a competitor shall win by the means of fair play. He believes that sportsmanship in next to godliness. He believes that top class performance can be developed through scientific coaching where a team of experts may assist a player. He further says that without scientific knowledge and training a sportsman cannot develop high performance in games and sports. Therefore, his whole idea and philosophy of Physical Education is that it should contribute to the health and development of everyone leading many sportsmen developing right from the school Physical Education programme.
Robson’s various Foreign visits as a Member of Indian Delegation:

1. Visited Prague, Hungry and Romania 1980
2. Visited to German Democratic Republic. 1981
3. Visited to Maryland, U.S.A. from UNESCO 1982 for International symposium in Physical Education and Sports programmes for Physically and Mentally handicapped held at University of Maryland.

A copy of the details of various visits of Robson Moses is presented in Appendix-5.

Conferences and Seminars Attended:


2. Presented a paper in the Seminar 1982 conducted during Silver Jubilee of L.N.C.P.E., Gwalior over the theme “Physical Education in Developing Countries in next 25 years”.

3. Was the chairman for the Seminar on 1984 “Research Guidance and Development of Research Laboratories”.

4. Prepared a report on “Improve Your Physical Fitness”.

A copy of the Papers presented in seminars is presented in Appendix -6.
**Robson as a Head of Various Committees:**

1. Acted as a Member Secretary of review committee on L.N.C.P.E. 1979
2. Acted as Chairman of organizing Committee for 22nd All India Competition for International Awards in Physical Fitness at L.N.C.P.E., Gwalior. 1983
3. Was the Director of National Resources and Documentation Centre.

**The Supporting documents for the above mentioned is presented in Appendix – 7.**

**Any Embarrassing Situation:**

In the profession of Physical Education where one is Head of the Institution there may be same undesirable circumstances but he did not think that they had hampered his spirit and had any problem in tackling them. He just took the problems on the stride whether he was at L.N.C.P.E., Annamallai College of Physical Education and Health Sciences or Algappa College of Physical Education. In L.N.C.P.E., he remembers that there were same students who were on the strike but they themselves turned back to classes because they did not belong to the roads but to classrooms. He does not remember that there was only
problem in settling down the problems. He kept persuading higher authorities till he reached his aim, as at times the recommendations were not accepted initially. He used various means to convince higher-ups. He does not think that there was any problem for him other than managing people, programme and facilities. Fortunately, wherever he worked, there was no problem of the funds. While working at L.N.C.P.E. Gwalior, he was told that fund is limited but he managed to obtain the funds by the Government. The only problem was to spend the money for the purpose it was sanctioned. He developed many facilities, research labs, besides new schemes such as Extension Services and National Documentation Centre. Problems sometimes came from the students and outsider when they entered in the Institution or the campus to create disturbance. At times some of the students were stopped from appearing in examinations. Such dissatisfied students created problem but in the long run the created problems ease out by themselves. He feels that there is no administrator with the problems which need to be tackled very carefully while
taking into the consideration the cause for the problem besides taking into confidence all those who are involved.

Robson's Linkings and Disliking:

Likings:

* Playing outdoor sports.
* Touring and Traveling
* To meet various people.
* Spending time with nature.
* Watching Television.

Touring:

In the year 1954, he went to London, toured Europe, Kailey, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, France, Geneva from New York and came back to India.

When he was at Spring Field College, U.S.A. he went to Florida, Niagara and Chicago. From L.N.C.P.E. he also visited many places as a member of Indian Delegation. He visited Spartakaid, U.S.S.R., Romania, Hungry and East Germany. When he was at University of Oregon for his
Doctoral Degree he went to Singapore, West Coast, California, Hawaii and lastly to San Francisco. Traveling and touring are two interesting things in his life.

Robson’s Message to upcoming Physical Educationists:

Physical Educationists are the pillars of society, so they have to shoulder the responsibility of building a very healthy, physically fit and a happy nation. They should not concentrate on developing one team only as spending most of the money for the team players but instead spending most of the money for the maximum players, spend most of the time for all the students and have programme for all rather than having a programme for few.

Massage:

“Have a Vision,

Have a Mission,

And then you will succeed in life”.

Robson Moses
FAMILY OF DR. ROBSON MOSES

Dr. Robson Moses

Mrs. Jasmine Moses

Have

One Son and Two Daughters

Son

Daughter

Daughter

Dr. Amrit Kumar Moses

Mrs. Joy Preseilla Athipan

Mrs. Sushela Raja

Married to

Mrs. Puneeta Moses

Mr. Prem Athipan

Mr. Raja Sunder Singh

Married to

Mr. Anand

Mr. Prakash

Mr. Arul Pratap

Mr. Anbu

Miss. Pratima

Fig. 1: Depicting the Family Tree of Robson Moses
Views of Dr. Amrit Kumar Moses:

He is the only son of Robson Moses and is working as a Lecturer of Physical Education at YMCA College of Physical Education, Chennai. He had his M.A. in Physical Education from Punjabi University and Masters Degree from Spring Field College, U.S.A. He told that his father is very strict but is sensitive and caring. He was always his motivating factor to make him successful in life. Dr. Amrit feels the influence of his father on his life. He says that his father does not have the habit of smoking and drinking. He always guided his children to be good citizens. He further adds that his father has a multi-dimensional personality. He is quite adjusting in varied situations and is also very flexible in house hold matters. He said that his father was instrumental in making him a good lawn Tennis player and because of him only he was included in the category of ranked players in Madhya Pradesh. His father always used to spend money on his trips and kits. He always helped him in the promotion of his life. As per his view Robson is very
good guide and a good friend to and he respect him as friend, guide and father.

**Robson’s Social Qualities:**

* His father is very social.
* Likes to meet various people.
* Good in cracking jokes.
* Instantly mixes up with people.

**Strong Points of Robson:**

* Motivating.
* Positive Thinker.
* Inspiring.
* He plans to finish work at any cost.
* Put a wholehearted effort.
* Have lot of patience.

**Views of Elder Daughter Mrs. Joy Presilapremadhiban:**

She told that she love his father very much. When she was in class 5th her father left for U.S.A. and most of the time they were with their mother and so she missed him
very much. She told that his father was always engrossed with his duties he always expected her to become like him.

With regard to Robson’s intellectual capacity she always admired him as the Principal of Algappa College of Physical Education, Karaikudi. She also used to go on trips with him. She admired his managerial qualities. She further adds that he can be kept in the category of genius.

**Robson’s Social Qualities:**

- He is very social and is friendly.
- He uses to participate in gatherings, ceremonies and meetings.
- He makes lasting relationships.
- He likes to make new friends.

**Robson’s Strong Points:**

- He is quite strict.
- He is too punctual.
- Very sincere and dedicated to his work.
Robson's Weak Point:

She feels that he has always given importance to his job and as such has neglected the family. She had missed her father's affection because he was always busy when she needed him badly.

Views of Younger Daughter Mrs. Sushila Raja:

She is B.Sc., M.Sc. and M.Phil from Palatheer with University Rank. M.Sc. 2nd Rank from Bharatdarshan University and M.Phil from Madras University.

She told that:

* He is very affectionate father.
* He is always supportive to genuine demands.
* He is too punctual.
* We have a happy family due to him.
* He never differentiates among his siblings.
* He inspires others.
* He is too social.
* He is not selfish and believes in charity.
SECTION TWO

VIEWS OF EMINENT PHYSICAL EDUCATIONISTS:

PROFESSOR AJMER SINGH VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON MOSES:

Professor Ajmer Singh’s views on:

Robson’s contribution to the field of physical education:

Robson in one among the few professionals in India whose contribution to Physical Education is of immense importance and most distinguished aspect of his contribution was his initiation for research. He was at the helm of affairs when M.Phil Courses were started in L.N.C.P.E. and he encouraged research in Physical Education motivating large number of teachers and scholars to enroll for Ph.D. prior to that there were very few professionals in field of Physical Education who had Ph.D. Degrees to their credit. He brought the profession at par with other subjects. Physical Educationists were not given the equal grades in Colleges and Universities as compared to other subjects like maths, physics, economics etc.
He also insisted to the authorities that a separate research block is needed in L.N.C.P.E. to boost research. Research labs were accredited with all available instruments, even from abroad though these were very expensive equipments.

He was instrumental in getting scholarship worth Rs. 5,000/- to the Ph.d scholars. Similarly financial help was given to encourage professional literature in the form of books.

**Professor Ajmer Singh’s Views on:**

**Robson’s Teaching Qualities:**

He stated that Robson was an excellent teacher, very knowledgeable in his field of specialization. His principle was to come to class well prepared for the topic to be taught. He encouraged healthy discussions during his teaching, involved students, encouraged good students and motivated students. He had the ability to draw maximum from his students.
His lectures were interesting as students never wanted to skip his classes. This speaks volumes of Robson being an excellent teacher, committed guide, inspiring leader whose sole aim in life was promotion of physical education. It is heartening to note that he succeeded in his mission. As a teacher he will remain a shining example of a distinguished person.

Professor Ajmer Singh’s Views on:

Robson’s Administrative Qualities:

He opined that his administration was admired and appreciated, even by his opponent, which is very creditable. During his tenure as Dean at L.N.C.P.E. some very important and bold decisions taken by him were shining examples of his very able and competent administrative qualities. Mischief Mongers, trouble creators in the college were handled very tactfully and efficiently. The so-called dada’s were shown their places. Some incompetent and un-susurplus elements were removed with iron hand inspite of threats to his life. For him college was above everything.
Robson upheld dignity of the profession even in the face of political pressures and gunda elements. He was a brave soldier, kept his head high and maintained the prestige of the chair be occupied. In short, he was a very competent administrator. Professor Ajmer Singh salutes him.

**Professor Ajmer Singh’s Views on:**

**Robson’s Scholarly Characteristics:**

According to him Robson was very intelligent and posses a very sharp mind. He could be kept in the category of genius.

**Professor Ajmer Singh’s Views on:**

**Robson’s attitudes towards scientific Physical Education**

He stated that Robson Moses could be said as the father of scientific era in Physical Education in India. Robson was of the view to test every thing scientifically before it is accepted. He not only gave thrust to the research
but also set many labs in India where students can be oriented about research in Physical Education.

**Professor Ajmer Singh’s Views on:**

**Robson’s Personality:**

He stated “Wonderful” is the world he would like to describe him. Every aspects of his personality serves as a light house to young professionals. He found him to be perfect example of a professional, very knowledgeable, competent, committed and 100% dedicated to his job. For him promotion of Physical Education was a mission, very dear to his heart. He was a born leader, served the profession to the best of his abilities. He was a well-read man always abreast with the latest trend in his profession.

He was very kind hearted, supportive, warm and lovable human being. He kept his cool even under very negative circumstances. He does not drink, not even tea or coffee inspite of his stay abroad. He was a very rare example of simplicity.
Once offered the Vice-Chancellorship of Jiwaji University, he politely refused, because he wanted to serve and promote Physical Education putting all his energies to one cause, Physical-Education made him a great leader.

Unfortunately he made some mistakes in his judgment of some people's caliber and commitment to the profession. The institute in particular and the profession in general got bad name due to his many choices, To error is human to forgive in divine.

PROFESSOR T.S. BRAR'S VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON MOSES:

Professor T.S. Brar’s views on:

Robson’s Contribution to field of Physical Education:

Professor T.S. Brar stated that Robson could be treated as the pioneers of Physical Education in India. He was the founder of establishing research labs in Physical Education and Sports sciences in the country. His role as an expert on various committees was praise worthy. The
recommendations of such committees went a long way to develop quality programme of Physical Education.

**Professor T.S. Brar’s Views on:**

**Robson’s Teaching Qualities:**

Robson was a good teacher as he possessed remarkable knowledge in his area of specialisation i.e. Research Methodology. He imparted knowledge using various techniques, like discussions, assignments, seminars etc. His methods of evaluation were also always innovative.

**Professor T.S. Brar’s Views on:**

**Robson’s Administrative Qualities:**

He opined that Robson was an excellent administrator and was energetic and full of ideas. He had good management skills and was always mobile.
However, he was restless, sometime very hasty in taking decisions and not very first in terms of the decisions made by him.

**Professor. T.S. Brar's Views on:**

**Robson’s Scholarly Qualities:**

While highlighting Robson’s Scholarly Qualities Professor T.S. Brar stated that Robson was a great scholar. He possessed remarkable command on techniques and methods of research. He was well read person. He also acted as a resource person in many seminars and conferences. He too, guided many students for Ph.D. and D.Litt. programmes.

**Professor T.S. Brar’s Views on:**

**Robson’s attitude towards scientific Physical Education:**

Professor T.S. Brar opined that Robson’s was full of ideas and over possessed mind towards research. He was
also responsible for incalculating a new trend towards research by starting higher courses like M.Phil. and Ph.D. for first time in Physical Education.

Prof. T.S. Brar’s Views on:

Robson’s Personality:

Professor T.S. Brar opined that: Robson was expressive energetic, full of ideas and sincere for the cause of Physical Education. He has total commitment towards physical education. Robson also possesses warm human relationship and always extended his help to the needy persons.

Dr. A.K. Uppal’s Views about Robson Moses:

Dr. A.K. Uppal’s Views on:

Robson’s contribution to the field of Physical Education:

He stated that Robson has made enormous contribution and provided considerable boost to research in
the field of Physical Education based on the modern philosophy. He encouraged scientific inputs in the curriculum. He also came up with new promotional schemes to uplift the profession and also made the necessary changes in the previous operational schemes that in later years gave many fruitful results.

**Dr. A.K. Uppal’s Views on:**

**Robson’s Teaching Qualities:**

As per Dr. Uppal, Robson was an excellent teacher with having great depth in his subject i.e. Research Methodology. His classes were interesting and inspiring. He always incorporated his teaching by various appropriate examples and always remained eager to take his classes. He was pragmatist and always insisted that students should learn by practical experiences, so for this he used to give them various assignments.
Dr. A.K. Uppal's Views on:

Robson's Administrative Qualities:

Dr. Uppal opined that Robson Moses was reasonably good as an administrator. However he could not bear administrative pressures when things went wrong. He always tried to force his own ideas on those working under him. Forced his personal views on his employees but with these he was courageous to face the challenges while on the seat. He always took bold decisions whenever the situation demands so.

Dr. A.K. Uppal's Views on:

Robson's Scholarly Qualities:

Dr. Uppal opined that Robson was a brilliant scholar. He always abreast him with the latest things, always come prepared to take his classes. He always gave the excellent ideas to various committees wherever he served. He also insists various scholars and guides them to acquire
research degrees in Physical Education and above the most he was always sincere to his assignments.

**Dr. A.K. Uppal’s Views on:**

**Robson’s attitude towards scientific Physical Education:**

Dr. Uppal opined that Robson always insisted to have scientific approach towards Physical Education. For this wherever he worked he established a research lab and insist student to conduct more and more research so that they can test the facts more scientifically. He also insisted to conduct the research in field of Physical Education and then solve the problems in a scientific manner by applying statistical techniques.

**Dr. A.K. Uppal’s Views on:**

**Robson’s Personality:**

Dr. Uppal stated that Robson was extrovert, intelligent and hard working. Respected the views of those on whom he had faith. He was a warm hearted person and thought
always for the benefit of the organisation wherever the served.

**PROFESSOR MOORTHY’S VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON’S MOSES:**

**Professor Moorthy’s views on:**

**Robson’s contribution to the field of Physical Education:**

Professor Moorthy stated that as a Physical Director in Arts and Science College at Karaikudi, as a player, as a teacher and as a coach he achieved high level in the game of basketball. His hard work, untiring professional efficiency elevated him as a first Principal in Algappa College of Physical Education Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu. His untiring interest towards the field of Physical Education in three decade as a Principal, made him Dean at L.N.C.P.E., Gwalior, then upto Vice Chancellor Of Jiwaji University. With all his achievements he established number of playing facilities, research labs and improved the existing one and
along with this he motivated various students to go for higher degrees in Physical Education.

Professor Moorothy's views on:

Robson's Teaching Qualities:

Professor Moorothy opined that Robson was an excellent teacher, disciplined, knowledgeable and innovative specially in his specialization i.e. Research Methodology. He was very punctual for his classes, even when he used to come from outside the station, he rushed to his class if the time permitted him. He encouraged students to make best use of library and also provided them the field experiences.

Professor Moorothy's views on:

Robson's Administrative Qualities:

Professor Moorothy said that Robson was good administrator par excellence. He tackled the administrative
problems very nicely. Never surrendered in any situation and he kept on fighting with the things till the job was done. He also never allowed any political pressure to pressurize him and also never took un-necessary advantage of his high position.

Professor Moorthy's views on:

Robson's Scholarly Qualities:

Professor Moorthy stated that Robson was a brilliant scholar and an intelligent fellow. He believes to keep himself abreast with the latest trends. He kept on reading literature and also motivated students to do so. His decisions carried the images of his scholarly characteristics. That is due to his scholarly abilities only that he remained member of many prestigious organisations and also served as an expert in various committees and was the member of Indian delegations abroad several times.
Professor Moorthy’s views on:

Robson’s attitude towards scientific Physical Education:

Professor Moorthy stated that Robson can be said a pioneer for scientific Physical Education. He further adds that Robson only started research labs wherever he worked and encouraged teachers and students to acquire research degrees. He also started many projects and gave students a chance to operate them scientifically. He was the fellow who motivated students to acquire Ph.D. and M.Phil. in Physical Education not only in India but abroad too. The research lab located in prestigious L.N.I.P.E., Gwalior, was also named after him as “Dr. Robson Complex”.

Professor Moorthy’s views on:

Robson’s Personality:

He stated that Robson was an admirable personality. Very learned, Intellectual and controlled. He was very friendly and warm hearted. He was too determined and
dedicative towards his job. He often behaved in a relaxed manner even in negative situations and tackled the situation tactfully; really he can be kept in the category of "Genius".

**Dr. INDU MAZUMDAR’S VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON MOSES:**

**Dr. Indu Mazumdar’s views on:**

**Robson Moses Contribution to the field of Physical Education:**

She opined that Robson was the founder Principal of Algappa College of Physical Education, Karai-kudi contributed a great deal in starting one of the institution of Physical Education in India. He was also instrumental in getting the autonomous status to the present L.N.I.P.E., Gwalior. Under his leadership only the research block was started and a lot of research was conducted in the college. There are very few leaders in Physical Education like him.
Dr. Indu Mazumdar’s views on:

Robson’s Teaching qualities:

She stated that as a teacher Robson was very well prepared and could explain the points very well. She had studied advanced statistics under him and found him well versed with the subject in whom he was able to explain and also made the subject very interesting. He was very academic oriented and always keen to teach either subjects or activities.

Dr. Indu Mazumdar’s views on:

Robson’s Administrative qualities:

She is of the view that he was a very strict administrator and would make people work. He was never afraid of making decisions and always struck to them. He was very honest and sincere in his work and had developed
a work culture among the employees. She remembered that when she was working in Algappa college of Physical Education under him, he used to make all the servants go for jogging before they start their work. It that time it sounded as if he was a dictator but new she feels how concerned he was about the health of his employees.

**Dr. Indu Mazumdar's views on:**

**Robson's Scholarly qualities:**

She said that Robson was very keen researcher and constantly talking and breathing research. He was instrumental in starting the research at L.N.C.P.E., Gwalior. Robson always made himself to abreast with latest trends in any field and he also developed book bank, so that students may also take the advantage of literature available.
Dr. Indu Mazumdar's views on:

Robson's attitude towards scientific Physical Education:

She stated that Robson is the only one of the founders of modern Physical Education in India. He worked very hard at L.N.C.P.E. to bring it on par with International Institutions and was successful in doing so. He was responsible for starting M.Phil at L.N.C.P.E., Gwalior and many students also completed Ph.D. under his able guidance.

Dr. Indu Mazumdar's views on:

Robson's Personality:

She stated that Robson Moses had a dynamic personality and remained constantly on the move. He was very caring and concerned about his employees. He was also very generous and never hesitated to help any one who asked him for help. He had an-immense knowledge and also thirst for it. He was a bit short-tempered man.
Dr. RAMESH PAL'S VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON MOSES:

Dr. Ramesh Pal's views on:

Robson’s contribution to the field of Physical Education:

Dr. Ramesh Pal said that Robson has contributed to the field of Physical Education in several aspects or ways; some of the important once are mentioned as below:

1. Dedicated his life for the upliftment of the status of Physical education in the country.

2. Always motivated the people to improve their professional competence and helped them.

3. Helped LNCPE, Gwalior to get the Autonomous status as a distinct college in the country in the field of Physical Education.

4. Encouraged People to conduct research in Physical Education.
5. Helped in Publication of the literature.

**Dr. Ramesh Pal’s views on:**

**Robson’s Teaching Qualities:**

As a teacher Robson served several organizations. Always prepared for the class, inspite of having other administrative duties. He could reach the students and helped them in and outside the classrooms. He had good command on subjects and language. Over all an ideal teacher.

**Dr. Ramesh Pal’s views on:**

**Robson’s Administrative qualities:**

Dr. Ramesh Pal opined that Robson happened to be a good Administrator also. Devoted lot of the time to find out the root cause of the problems and acted accordingly. Under his guidance the institutions have grown to great extent. He
has done his job to utmost efficiency as Principal, Dean and Chairman Board of Management of LNIPE, Gwalior. He was too honest, sincere and hardworking administrator.

**Dr. Ramesh Pal’s views on:**

**Robson’s Scholarly qualities:**

Dr. Ramesh Pal said that Robson as a student was a good student and recipient of the Full Bright scholarship of U.S.A. twice. He conducted and supervised the research work in Physical Education in India as well as abroad. Due to his scholastic approach, he could establish himself as reputed scholar in the field of Physical Education.

**Dr. Ramesh Pal’s views on:**

**Robson’s attitude towards scientific Physical education:**

Dr. Ramesh Pal opined that Robson was a unique man of Physical Education who really had scientific attitude towards Physical Education. He was confident that only by
conducting research the profession would grow and he strived for it throughout the life. The Research Block at LNIPE, Gwalior was his idea. Due to his efforts the institution was conferred the status of a Deemed University, to carry out the research in the specialized area of Physical Education.

Dr. Ramesh Pal’s views on:

Robson’s Personality:

He opined that overall Robson was an outstanding personality or real Physical Educationist. He always stressed upon that in addition to physical activity the academic area should be developed. He himself participated in the sports regularly as student and as a professional. He was very friendly with the nature and always has appetite for learning. The profession of the Physical Education will always remain obliged of such a personality.
DR. DILIP DHURIYA'S VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON MOSES:

Dr. Dilip Dhuriya's views on:

Robson's Contribution to Physical Education:

He stated that Robson contributed a lot to the field of Physical Education. He is the only one who encouraged Physical Educators to acquire research projects and promoted research work. His vision was very vast. He helped Physical Educationist to step up in 21st Century with latest knowledge and helped in introducing sophisticated instruments for advance research. He helped Physical Educationists by creating opportunities for better placement. Further, he attempted to create awareness of masses for improvement of Physical Fitness through N.P.F.P.
Dr. Dilip Dhuriya's views on:

Robson's Teaching Qualities:

He opined that he admired Robson as a teacher. His approach was very positive. He was always eager to take his classes even though he was the Dean of the College. His teaching had variations. He always encouraged discussions among students. He encouraged students to make maximum use of library. He promoted use of Audio visual aids during teaching that helped in providing atmosphere for creative work. His teaching was good. He used to involve all the students to participate in group discussions and completing assignments.

Dr. Dilip Dhuriya's views on:

Robson's Administrative Qualities:

He opined that Robson as an administrator was not democratic. He always used his position while taking decisions, which might at times effected positively or
negatively. On one side he used to encourage the contribution of staff while framing the policies but on the other side he did not delegate the authority with responsibility. But Robson had tremendous capacity to handle the complex problems with competency and clarity. He had never taken benefit of his position. He was an administrator for excellence. He never hesitated to bear the responsibility of his decisions. As an administrator he was too efficient. With his positive vision he has given a way to the College L.N.C.P.E. to become an Institute (Autonomous body). Dr. Dilip had learned a lot from his administrative approach, which is helping him for his success as an administrator at Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

**Dr. Dilip Dhuriya's views on:**

**Robson's Scholarly Qualities:**

He stated that Robson was a great scholar in the field of Physical Education. He was very pragmatic, sincere and honest to his assignments and had scientific approach. He had published articles and research papers in various
National and International journals. He initiated publication in the field of Physical Education. He personally admires Robson and always tried to follow his footsteps for the development of Physical Education in India.

**Dr. Dilip Dhuriya’s views on:**

**Robson’s attitude towards scientific Physical Education:**

He opined that Robson was a great researcher. He has not only given a boost to research in Physical Education but also gave a very appropriate definition to research i.e. “Quest for Knowledge”. Robson is only one in India who promoted research in Physical Education in India.

Even after his retirement, he is enthusiastic to promote physical education and sports among masses. His approach was to give maximum practical experiences to children, so that they may solve the problems in systematic and scientific manner.
Dr. Dilip Dhuriya’s views on:

Robson’s Personality:

He opined that Robson is a warm-hearted person who behaves in a relaxed and sober manner. He was a practical man, away from shrewdness. He was too punctual and dedicated towards his duties and responsibilities. He always took his own decisions while framing the rules. Robson not only had a pleasant personality but he was very cooperative and always ready to help the needy. Dr. Dilip always admired him and tried to follow his footsteps for bright future.

MR. C.V. RAO’S VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON MOSES:

Mr.C.V.Rao’s views on:

Robson’s Contribution to the Field of Physical Education:

Mr. C.V Rao opined that Robson is one of the few who acquired the Doctorate from Spring Field College, U.S.A. He encouraged large numbers to earn higher degrees in
Physical Education. He set example of a fit individual with regular participation in fitness activities even after retirement. As Dean and Chairman Board Of Management of the Institute he took genuine interest in the Institution i.e. L.N.I.P.E.

**Mr.C.V.Rao's views on:**

**Robson's Teaching Qualities:**

Mr. C.V. Rao stated that Robson had interest and proficiency in variety of subjects in Physical Education. A good conservationist with story telling capacity. Eager to teach and punctual in assignments. He always believed in library reading and was crazy for the research work.

**Mr.C.V.Rao's views on:**

**Robson's Administrative Qualities:**

He said that Robson was excellent in keeping records. He had driving force to have better contribution from staff. He always encouraged staff to get higher degrees for better
prospects. He used extension services for the betterment of profession and welfare of the community. He always maintained excellent relations with Government and other higher authorities and utilized them for the betterment of institution.

**Mr.C.V.Rao's views on:**

**Robson's Scholarly Qualities:**

Mr. C.V. Rao opined that Robson was always interested in reading scientific journals and books. With his pleasing manners and personality, he played a key role in bringing renowned Physical Educationist in the college.

He was always very much interested in starting new projects all the time. He also initiated projects like National Resources and Documentation Center, Extension Services like training of tribal schoolteachers, publication of literature of Physical Education and allied subjects and strengthening of Physical Education Colleges etc.
Mr. C.V. Rao's views on:

Robson's attitude towards scientific Physical Education:

He opined that Robson was very much interested in latest development in the profession. He was also very much enthusiastic in people acquiring higher degrees. Always believed in bringing change even if not very much practical.

Mr. C.V. Rao's views on:

Robson's Personality:

Mr. C.V. Rao said that Robson had a very pleasing Personality. He always acted in a dominant manner till he landed into some sort of trouble. He never accepted the failure. He always believed in changing established things in the hope that something better will come out.
Dr. A.K. DATTA VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON MOSES:

Dr. A.K. Datta's views on:

Robson's contribution to the field of Physical Education:

Dr. A.K. Datta stated that Robson played a pivotal role in the field of Physical Education by contributing significantly for its upliftment. Robson was instrumental in starting M.Phil and Doctoral Programmes in Physical Education. Due to his efforts, many Physical Educationists have acquired Doctoral Degree that lead to the enhancement of the status of Physical Education profession. Generally Physical Educationists used to be specialists in a particular game /sport but Robson provided a new dimension by making them specialists in a theory subject.
Dr. A.K. Datta's views on:

Robson's teaching qualities:

Dr. A.K. Datta said that Robson was a great teacher. All those who studied under him, admired his teaching techniques. He was a well read person and used to prepare adequately for the class. Some of his students were overheard by the undersigned that he knew each and every word of Research Method written by Harrison Clarke. He used to relate the topic with the topic already transfer by him by giving appropriate examples as well as references.

As a teacher, he was a hard taskmaster and made his students consult books, journal and periodicals for gaining insight.

Dr. A.K. Datta's views on:

Robson's Administrative qualities:

Dr. A.K. Datta was of the view that Robson was an excellent Administrator so far as getting work from his
subordinates. He promoted work-culture among his staff. Due to his innovativeness, he created newer Departments in the LNCPE, appointed staff and get the sanction of necessary finances.

Robson tried to undo many past practices in LNCPE as a result of which few staff and students did not have cordial relations with him.

He used to look after the welfare of his staff by way of organising recreational programmes, outings, besides creating openings for their promotions.

**Dr. A.K. Datta's views on:**

**Robson’s scholarly qualities:**

Dr. A.K. Datta stated that it will not be in appropriate if he place Robson in the category of true scholar who was always keen not only to learn but also to impart knowledge to all those who came into his contact. Due to his education in U.S.A. and also keeping his personal qualities in mind, he
was far above in knowledge than his professional colleagues and as such he was admired for his scholarly qualities.

Robson had a mission to uplift the profession of Physical Education and for which he left no stone unturned. All those Physical Educationists to whom he guided in research and administrative work are now occupying prestigious positions in India and abroad.

Dr. A.K. Datta's views on:

Robson's attitude towards scientific Physical Education:

Dr. A.K. Datta said that Robson promoted Physical Education on scientific lines, as he possessed a scientific attitude. He wanted to make Physical Education at par with other subjects, so he took the help of science in convincing others about the potentialities as well as benefits of Physical Education. Due to his efforts combined with the efforts of others, Physical Education has got a susceptible place in the society.
He was a firm believer that perfection of any movement ought to have a theoretical base. He used to emphasize on how and why of a particular movement.

Dr. A.K. Datta’s views on:

Robson’s personality:

Dr. A.K. Datta opined that Robson had a charming personality. He was outgoing, extrovert, tough minded, intelligent as well as self-assured individual. He was a good speaker as well as listener.

He used to look after the welfare of his staff. He was fond of food as such was always eager to invite others. He also was always eager visit the families of staff for promoting harmony.
Dr. RAJENDRA SINGH VIEWS ABOUT ROBSON MOSES:

Dr. Rajendra Singh's views on:

Robson's Contribution to the Field of Physical Education

Dr. Rajendra Singh stated that Robson contributed Physical Education in following Ways:

1. Physical Education was promoted in the tribal school of M.P.

2. The Programme of National Physical Fitness Programme was popularised and was conducted at all Levels including National Level at a very large scale.

3. Journals of Physical Education having research articles were stated at L.N.C.P.E. in 1982 January.

4. Organised many National Level conferences in Physical Education.
5. Started National Research Documentation Centre at the College for the first time in Country in Physical Education.

6. Established Research Labs at various colleges.

**Dr. Rajendra Singh’s views on:**

**Robson’s Teaching Qualities:**

Dr. Rajendra Singh opined that Robsons Moses was a very effective teacher in teaching Research Methodology and Statistics. He was very good in communication, and fair in his approach. He believed in promoting the interest of students in library reading and abstracting research articles.

To conclude he has been one of the excellent teacher.
Dr. Rajendra Singh’s views on:

Dr. Rajendra Singh was of the view that Dr. Robson had been a very dynamic administration having very good vision for future of the profession and colleges. It is due to his administrative abilities that the L.N.C.P.E. attained the status of autonomous college and he further, planned for Deemed University status. He promoted work culture in the college at all levels. No teacher could come late to the class during his leadership as Dean at the College.

Dr. Rajendra Singh’s views on:

Dr. Robson Scholarly Qualities:

Dr. Rajendra Singh opined that Robson Moses was very good scholar and was deeply interested in doing or getting same research projects completed. It was due to his keen interest in research that research labs were established and there was a research committee responsible for checking each thesis of M.P.E. and M.Phil students before submission.
He was a very great scholar of research.

**Dr. Rajendra Singh's views on:**

**Robson's attitude towards Scientific Physical Education:**

Dr. Rajendra Singh stated that Robson's attitude towards Physical Education was only scientific. He laid more stress on scientific aspects of Physical Education.

**Dr. Rajendra Singh's views on:**

**Robson's Personality:**

Dr. Rajendra Singh opined that Robson Moses was extrovert, intelligent, outgoing, warm hearted, neat and clean and socially adjusted individual. He always believed in social gatherings and cultural events.

He was sharp thinker. He used to be very sensitive on issues related to the status of L.N.C.P.E.
The opinion of various Physical Educationists and Sports Persons on the Personality of Robson Moses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Contemporaries</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Usually affected by feelings.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>31.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Behaved in a sober manner.</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Followed rules.</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Behaved boldly in decision-making.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Acted in self-reliant manner.</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.45</td>
<td>41.81</td>
<td>19.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Did not trust others.</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Was a practical man.</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>47.27</td>
<td>15.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Was shrewd.</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Respected established traditions.</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.81</td>
<td>43.63</td>
<td>22.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Behaved in a relaxed manner.</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>30.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Was a warm-hearted person.</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>23.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Acted in a controlled manner.</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.72</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td>19.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Acted in a dominant manner.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.27</td>
<td>43.63</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Took his own decisions.</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>41.81</td>
<td>14.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Possessed a good reasoning capacity.</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.81</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROBSON'S PERSONALITY:

The opinions of various Physical Educationists and sports persons on the Personality of Robson Moses have been given in Table - 1.

Table - 1 indicates that out of a total of 70 students, 30% agreed, 27.1% strongly agreed, 31.4% disagreed and 11.4% strongly disagreed. Table further depicts that majority of students 57.1% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 42.8% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson Moses was usually affected by feelings.

Among the 30 colleagues, 16.6% agreed, 16.6% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 36.6% strongly disagreed. Table further depicts that majority of the colleagues 66.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed whereas 33.2% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson Moses was usually affected by feelings.
From among the 10 contemporaries 10% agreed, 10% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed and 40% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority of contemporaries 80% either disagreed or strongly disagreed whereas 20% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson Moses was usually affected by feelings.

The responses of students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 24.54% agreed, 22.72% strongly agreed 31.81 disagreed and 20.90% strongly disagreed that Robson was usually affected by feelings. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure-2.
Fig. 2 Usually affected by Feelings.
Table – 1 indicates that out of a total of 70 students, 32.8% agreed, 20% strongly agreed, 21.4% disagreed and 25.7% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that 52.8% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 47.1% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson Moses behaved in a sober manner.

Out of 30 colleagues, 46.6% agreed, 33.3% strongly agreed, 13.3% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that 79.9% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 19.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson Moses behaved in a sober manner.

Among 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further shows that 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson Moses behaved in a sober manner.
The responses of students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 38.18% agreed, 24.54% strongly agreed, 18.18% disagreed and 19.09% strongly disagreed that Robson behaved in a Sober Manner. The data pertaining to this presented in Figure – 3.
Fig. 3 Behaved in a sober manner
Table - 1 indicates that out of a total of 70 students, 34.2% agreed, 52.8% strongly agreed, 12.8% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that 87% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 12.8% either disagreed that Robson followed rules.

Among 30 colleagues, 23.3% agreed, 66.6% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that 89.9% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 10% disagreed that Robson followed rules.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further shows that majority of contemporaries 80% either agreed or strongly agreed whereas 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson followed rules.

The responses of students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 32.72% agreed, 53.63% strongly agreed, 11.81% disagreed and
0.90% strongly disagreed that Robson followed rules. The data pertaining to this presented in Figure – 4.
Fig. 4 Followed rules
Table - 1 indicates that out of a total of 70 students, 30% agreed, 54.02% strongly agreed, 8.5% disagreed and 7.1 strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority of students 84.2% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 15.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson behaved boldly in decision-making.

Out of 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 13.3% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority of colleagues 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 19.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson behaved boldly in decision-making.

Among 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority of contemporaries 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson behaved boldly in decision-making.
The responses of students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 32.72% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 7.27% strongly disagreed that Robson behaved boldly in decision making. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 5.
Fig. 5 Behaved boldly in decision making
Table - 1 indicates that among 70 students, 47.1% agreed, 42.8% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority of students 89.9% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson acted in self-reliant manner.

Among 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 36.6% strongly agreed, 13.3% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority of his colleagues 76.6% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 23.3% either disagreed strongly disagreed that Robson acted in self-reliant manner.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further disclose that majority of contemporaries 60% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 40% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson acted in self reliant manner.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 35.45% agreed, 41.81 strongly agreed, 19.09 disagreed and 3.63% strongly disagreed that Robson acted in self reliant. The data pertaining to it is depicted in Figure – 6.
Fig. 6 Acted in a self reliant manner
Table - 1 indicates that among 70 students, 22.8% agreed, 22.8% strongly agreed, 37.1% disagreed, and 17.1% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority of students 54.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 45.6% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson did not trust others.

Out of 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 46.6% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority of his colleagues 79.9% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson did not trust others.

Among 10 contemporaries, who took part in the study responded 40% agreed, 10% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority of his contemporaries 50% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 50% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson did not trust others.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 27.27% agreed, 28.18% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 14.54% strongly disagreed that Robson did not trust others. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 7.
Fig. 7 Did not trust others
Table - 1 indicates that among 70 students, 24.2% agreed, 51.4% strongly agreed, 15.7% disagreed and 8.5% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority of students 75.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 24.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was a practical man.

Out of 30 colleagues, 23.3% agreed, 43.3% strongly agreed, 13.3% disagreed and 20% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority of colleagues 66.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 33.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was a practical man.

Among 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority of his contemporaries 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% of his contemporaries disagreed that Robson was a practical man.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 26.36% agreed, 47.27% strongly agreed, 15.45% disagreed and 10.90% strongly disagreed that Robson was a practical man. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 8.
Fig. 8 Was a practical man
Table – 1 indicates that among 70 students, 25.7% agreed, 35.7% strongly agreed, 22.8% disagreed and 15.7% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority of his students 61.4% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 38.5% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was shrewd.

Out of 30 colleagues, 13.3% agreed, 6.6% strongly agreed, 33.3% disagreed and 46.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority of his colleagues 79.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 19.9% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson was shrewd.

Among 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 0% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed, and 50% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 10% only agree that Robson was shrewd.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 20.90% agreed, 24.54% strongly agreed, 27.27% disagreed and 27.27% strongly disagreed that Robson was shrewd. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 9.
Fig. 9 Was Shrewd
Table - 1 indicates that out of 70 students, 31.4% agreed, 42.8% strongly agreed, 24.2% disagreed, and 1.4% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 74.2% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 25.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson respected established traditions.

Out of 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 43.3% strongly agreed, 16.6% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 83.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 16.6% disagreed that Robson respected established traditions.

Among 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 60% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 40% disagreed that Robson respected established traditions.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 31.81% agreed, 43.63% strongly agreed, 22.72% disagreed and 0.90% strongly disagreed that Robson respected established traditions. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure-10.
Fig. 10 Respected established traditions
Table - 1 indicates that out of 70 students, 32.8% agreed, 28.5% strongly agreed, 27.1% disagreed and 11.4% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 61.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 38.5% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson behaved in relaxed manner.

Out of 30 colleagues, 13.0% agreed, 16.0% strongly agreed, 33.0% disagreed and 38.0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 71.0% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 29.0% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson behaved in relaxed manner.

Among 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 20% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 70% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 30% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson behaved in relaxed manner.
Agree
Strongly Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

Fig. 11 Behaved in a relaxed manner
Table – 1 indicates that out of 70 students, 38.5% agreed, 38.5% strongly agreed, 22.8% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 77% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 22.8% disagreed that Robson was a warm-hearted person.

Among 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 33.3% strongly agreed, 23.3% disagreed, and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 66.6% either agreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 33.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was a warm-hearted person.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 30% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 60% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 40% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson was a warm-hearted person.

The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 34.54% agreed, 36.36% strongly agreed 23.63% disagreed and 5.45% strongly disagreed that Robson was a warm-hearted person. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 12.
Fig. 12 Was a Warm hearted person
Table - 1 indicates that out of 70 students, 45.7% agreed, 31.4% strongly agreed, 22.8% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further depicts that majority 77.1% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 22.8% disagreed that Robson acted in a controlled manner.

Among 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 33.3% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed, and 16.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 73.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 26.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson acted in a controlled manner.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agree, 50% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% disagreed that Robson acted in a controlled manner.

The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 42.72 agreed, 33.63 strongly agreed, 19.09 disagreed and 4.54 strongly disagreed that Robson acted in a controlled manner. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 13.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 29.09% agreed, 23.63% strongly agreed, 30.90% disagreed and 17.09% strongly disagreed that Robson behaved in relaxed manner. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 11.
Fig. 13 Acted in a controlled manner
Table - 1 indicates that out of 70 students, 40% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% disagreed that Robson acted in a dominant manner.

Among 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 46.6% strongly agreed, 16.6% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 79.9% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 19.9% either disagreed strongly disagreed that Robson acted in a dominant manner.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson acted in a dominant manner.

The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 37.27% agreed, 43.63% strongly agreed, 18.18% disagreed and 0.90% strongly disagreed that Robson acted in a dominant manner. The data pertaining to this presented in Figure- 14
Fig. 14 Acted in a dominant manner
Table - 1 indicates that out of 70 students, 51.8% agreed, 17.8% strongly agreed, 18.5% disagreed and 11.4% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 69.2% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 29.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson took his own decisions.

Among 30 colleagues, 36.6% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 6.6% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 86.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 13.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson took his own decisions.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson took his own decisions.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 34.54% agreed, 41.81 strongly agreed, 14.54% disagreed and 9.09% strongly disagreed that Robson took his own decisions. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 15.
Fig. 15 Took his own decisions
Table - 1 indicates that among 70 students, 31.4% agreed, 38.5% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 8.5% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 69.9% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 28.5% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson possessed a good reasoning capacity.

Among 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 33.3% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 13.3% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 66.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 33.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson possessed a good reasoning capacity.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed, and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 70% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 30% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson possessed a good reasoning capacity.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 31.81% agree, 38.18% strongly agree, 20% disagree and 10% strongly disagree that Robson possessed a good reasoning capacity. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 16.
Fig. 16 Possessed a good reasoning capacity
The opinion of various Physical Educationists and Sports Persons on the Administrative Qualities of Robson Moses:

| S. No. | Statements                                      | Students |                |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|--------|------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|        |                                                | A        | SA             | D     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|        |                                                | SA       |                |       | D     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|        |                                                | SD       |                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 1.     | Kept all the records upto date.                | 37.1     | 58.5           | 4.2   | 0     | 43.3  | 40    | 10    | 6.6   | 30    | 60    | 10    | 0     | 38.18 | 53.63 | 6.36 | 1.81 |
| 2.     | Encouraged the contribution of staff.          | 37.1     | 44.2           | 18.5  | 0     | 40    | 50    | 3.3   | 6.6   | 40    | 50    | 0     | 10    | 38.18 | 46.36 | 12.72 | 2.72 |
| 3.     | Appointed staff on merit.                      | 28.5     | 51.4           | 20    | 0     | 33.3  | 23.3  | 26.6  | 16.6  | 10    | 20    | 40    | 30    | 28.18 | 40.90 | 23.63 | 7.27 |
| 4.     | Delegated authority and responsibility clearly. | 35.7     | 51.4           | 12.8  | 0     | 30    | 36.6  | 23.3  | 10    | 50    | 30    | 10    | 10    | 35.45 | 45.45 | 15.45 | 3.63 |
| 5.     | Involved staff in framing the policies.        | 40       | 35.7           | 15.7  | 8.5   | 33.3  | 43.3  | 16.6  | 6.6   | 40    | 50    | 0     | 10    | 38.18 | 39.09 | 14.54 | 8.18 |
| 6.     | Encouraged and promoted staff for better future prospects. | 32.8     | 52.8           | 11.4  | 2.8   | 26.6  | 40    | 16.6  | 16.6  | 50    | 30    | 10    | 10    | 32.72 | 47.27 | 12.72 | 7.27 |
| 7.     | Provided a reasonable training load.           | 37.1     | 50             | 12.8  | 0     | 16.6  | 26.6  | 33.3  | 23.3  | 40    | 50    | 0     | 10    | 31.81 | 43.63 | 17.27 | 7.27 |
| 8.     | Framed policies based on facts.                | 34.2     | 44.2           | 17.1  | 4.2   | 40    | 33.3  | 20    | 6.6   | 30    | 60    | 0     | 10    | 35.45 | 42.72 | 16.36 | 5.45 |
| 9.     | Used the facilities of institution for welfare of local community. | 22.8     | 45.7           | 22.8  | 8.5   | 26.6  | 43.3  | 16.6  | 13.3  | 30    | 50    | 20    | 0     | 24.54 | 45.45 | 20.90 | 9.09 |
| 10.    | Was an administrator par excellence.           | 20       | 48.5           | 30    | 1.4   | 30.6  | 40    | 06    | 23.3  | 30    | 50    | 16    | 04    | 22.72 | 46.36 | 28.72 | 2.18 |
| 11.    | Administrative approach was always democratic. | 28.5     | 22.8           | 35.7  | 14.8  | 13.3  | 13.3  | 33.3  | 40    | 10    | 10    | 50    | 30    | 22.72 | 19.09 | 36.36 | 21.81 |
| 12.    | Never used his position for personal benefits. | 37.1     | 51.4           | 8.5   | 2.8   | 40    | 43.3  | 10    | 6.6   | 30    | 60    | 10    | 0     | 37.27 | 50    | 9.09  | 3.63 |
| 13.    | Had tremendous capacity to handle the complex problem with contemporary and clarity. | 41.4     | 47.1           | 6.7   | 5.7   | 33.3  | 50    | 3.3   | 13.3  | 50    | 40    | 10    | 0     | 40    | 47.27 | 5.45  | 7.27 |
| 14.    | Never hesitated to bear responsibility of his decisions. | 31.4     | 51.4           | 10    | 7.1   | 30    | 40    | 10    | 20    | 10    | 30    | 40    | 20    | 29.09 | 46.36 | 12.72 | 11.81 |
| 15.    | Asked for support on personal basis.          | 25.7     | 5.7            | 38.5  | 30    | 10    | 13.3  | 36.6  | 40    | 0     | 20    | 30    | 50    | 19.09 | 9.09  | 37.27 | 34.54 |
ROBSON'S ADMINISTRATIVE QUALITIES:

The opinions of various Physical Educationists and sports persons on Administrative Qualities of Robson Moses have been given in Table – 2.

Table 2 indicates that among 70 students, 37.1% agreed, 58.5% strongly agreed, 4.2% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 95.6% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 4.2% disagreed that Robson kept all the records upto date.

Among 30 colleagues, 43.3% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 83.3% agreed and strongly agreed, whereas 16.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson kept all the records upto date.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 90% either agreed or strongly
agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson kept all the records up to date.

The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together point out that 38.18% agreed, 53.63% strongly agreed, 6.36% disagreed and 1.81% strongly disagreed that Robson kept all the records up to date. The data pertaining to it is presented in Figure – 17.
Fig. 17 Kept all the records upto date
Table 2 indicates that among 70 students, 37.1% agreed, 44.2% strongly agreed, 18.5% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Further the table reveals that majority 81.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 18.5% disagreed that Robson encouraged the contribution of staff.

Out of 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 3.3% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Further table reveals that majority 90% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 9.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged the contribution of staff.

Among 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged the contribution of staff.

The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 38.18% agreed, 46.36% strongly agreed, 12.72% disagreed and 2.72% strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged the contribution of staff. The data pertaining to it is presented in Figure – 18.
Fig. 18 Encouraged the contribution of staff
Table – 2 indicates that among 70 students, 28.5% agreed, 51.4% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further that majority 79.9% either agreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 20% disagreed that Robson appointed staff on merit.

Out of 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 23.3% strongly agreed, 26.6% disagreed and 16.6% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 56.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 43.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson appointed staff on merit.

Among 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 20% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed and 30% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 70% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 30% either agreed on strongly agreed that Robson appointed staff or merit.

The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 28.18% agreed, 40.90% strongly agreed, 23.63 disagreed and 7.27 strongly disagreed that Robson appointed staff on merit. The data pertaining to it is presented in Figure – 19.
Fig. 19 Appointed staff on merit
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 35.7% agreed, 51.4% strongly agreed, 12.8% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed Table further that majority 87.1% either agreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 12.8% disagreed that Robson delegated authority and responsibility clearly.

Out of 30 colleagues, 30% agree, 36.6% strongly agreed, 23.3% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 66.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 33.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson delegated authority and responsibility clearly.

Among 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 20% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson delegated authority and responsibility clearly.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 35.45% agreed, 45.45% strongly agreed, 15.45 disagreed and 3.63 strongly disagreed that Robson delegated authority and responsibility clearly. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 20.
Fig. 20 Delegated authority and responsibility clearly
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 40% agreed, 35.7% strongly agreed, 15.7% disagreed and 8.5% strongly disagreed. Table further that majority 75.7% either agreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 24.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson involved staff in framing the policies.

Out of 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 43.3% strongly agreed, 16.6% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 76.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 23.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson involved staff in framing the policies.

Among 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson involved staff in framing the policies.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 38.18% agreed, 39.09% strongly agreed, 14.54 disagreed and 8.18 strongly disagreed that Robson involved staff in framing the policies. The data pertaining to it is presented in Figure – 21.
Fig. 21 Involved staff in framing the policies
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 32.8% agreed, 52.8% strongly agreed, 11.4% disagreed and 2.8% strongly disagreed. Table further that majority 85.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 14.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged and promoted staff for better future prospects.

Out of 30 colleagues, 26.6% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 16.6% disagreed and 16.6% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 66.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 33.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged and promoted staff for better future prospects.

Among 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged and promoted staff for better future prospects.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 32.72% agreed, 47.27% strongly agreed, 12.72 disagreed and 7.27 strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged and promoted staff for better future prospects. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 22.
Fig. 22 Encouraged and promoted staff for better future prospects
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 37.1% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 12.8% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 87.1% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 12.8% disagreed that Robson provided a reasonable training load.

Among 30 colleagues, 16.6% agreed, 26.6% strongly agreed, 33.3% disagreed and 23% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 56.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 43.6% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson provided a reasonable training load.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% strongly disagreed that Robson provided a reasonable training load.

The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 31.81% agreed, 43.63% strongly agreed, 17.27 disagreed and 7.27 strongly disagreed that Robson provided a reasonable training load. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 23.
Fig. 23 Provided a reasonable training load
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 34.2% agreed, 44.2% strongly agreed, 17.1% disagreed and 4.2% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority 78.4% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 21.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson framed policies based on facts.

Among 30 colleagues, 40% agree, 33.3% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 73.3% either agreed or strongly agreed whereas 26.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson framed policies based on facts.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agree, 60% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% strongly disagreed that Robson framed policies based on facts.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 35.45% agreed, 42.72% strongly agreed, 16.36% disagreed and 5.45% strongly disagreed that Robson framed policies based on facts. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 24.
Fig. 24 Framed policies based on facts
Table 2 indicates that among 70 students, 22.8% agreed, 45.7% strongly agreed, 22.8% disagreed and 8.5% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority 68.5% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 31.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson used facilities of institution for welfare of local community.

Among 30 colleagues, 26.6% agreed, 43.3% strongly agreed, 16.6% disagreed and 13.3% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 69.9% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 29.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson used the facilities of institution for welfare of local community.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% disagreed that Robson used facilities institution for the welfare of local community.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 24.54% agreed, 45.45% strongly agreed, 20.90% disagreed and 9.09% strongly disagreed that Robson used facilities of institution for the welfare of local community. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 25.
Fig. 25 Used the facilities of the institution for the welfare of local community
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 20% agreed, 48.5% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 1.4% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority 68.5% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 31.4% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was an administrator par excellence.

Among 30 colleagues, 30.6% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 6% disagreed and 23.3% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 70.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 29.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was an administrator par excellence.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 16% disagreed and 4% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was an administrator par excellence.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 22.72% agreed, 46.36% strongly agreed, 28.72% disagreed and 2.18% strongly disagreed that Robson was an administrator par excellence. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 26.
Fig. 26 Was an administrator par excellence
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 28.5% agreed, 22.8% strongly agreed, 35.7% disagreed and 14.8% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 50.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 49.5% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson administrative approach was always democratic.

Among 30 colleagues, 13.3% agreed, 13.3% strongly agreed, 33.3% disagreed and 40% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 73.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 26.6% either disagreed or strongly agreed that Robson administrative approach was always democratic.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 10% strongly agreed, 50% disagreed and 30% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 80% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 20% agreed or strongly agreed that Robson administrative approach was always democratic.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 22.72% agreed, 19.09% strongly agreed, 36.36% disagreed and 21.81% strongly disagreed that Robson administrative approach was always democratic. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 27.
Fig. 27 Administrative approach was always democratic
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 37.1% agreed, 51.4% strongly agreed, 8.5% disagreed and 2.8% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority 88.5% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 11.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson never used his position for personal benefits.

Among 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 43.3% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 83.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 16.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson never used his position for personal benefits.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson never used his position for personal benefits.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 37.27% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 9.09% disagreed and 3.63% strongly disagreed that Robson never used his position for personal benefits. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 28.
Fig. 28 Never used his position for personal benefits.
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 41.4% agreed, 47.1% strongly agreed, 6.7% disagreed and 5.7% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority 88.5% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 11.4% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson had tremendous capacity to handled the complex problem with competency and clarity.

Among 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 3.3% disagreed and 13.3% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 83.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 16.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson had tremendous capacity to handled complex problem with competency and clarity.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly agreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson had tremendous
capacity to handled complex problem with competency and clarity.

The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 40% agreed, 47.27% strongly agreed, 5.45% disagreed and 7.27% strongly disagreed that Robson had tremendous capacity to handled complex problem with competency and clarity. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 29.
Fig. 29 Had tremendous capacity to handle the complex problem with competency and clarity
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 31.4% agreed, 51.4% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 7.1% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority 82.8% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 17.1% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson never hesitated to bear responsibility of his decisions.

Among 30 colleagues, 30% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 20% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 70% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 30% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson never hesitated to bear the responsibility of his decisions.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed and 20% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 60% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 40% either agree or strongly agree that Robson never hesitated to bear the responsibility of his decisions.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 29.09% agreed, 46.36% strongly agreed, 12.72% disagreed and 11.81% strongly disagreed that Robson never hesitated to bear responsibility of his decisions. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 30.
Fig. 30 Never hesitated to bear the responsibility of his own decisions
Table - 2 indicates that among 70 students, 25.7% agreed, 5.7% strongly agreed, 38.5% disagreed and 30% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 68.5% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 31.4% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson asked for support on personal basis.

Among 30 colleagues, 10% agreed, 13.3% strongly agreed, 36.6% disagreed and 40% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 76.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 23.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson asked for support on personal basis.

Out of 10 contemporaries 0% agreed, 20% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 50% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 20% strongly agreed that Robson asked for support on personal basis.
The responses given by students, colleagues and contemporaries together points out that 19.09% agreed, 9.09% strongly agreed, 37.27% disagreed and 34.54% strongly disagreed that Robson asked for support on personal basis. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 31.
Fig. 31 Asked for support on personal basis
The opinion of various Physical Educationists and Sports Persons on the Scholarly Qualities of

Robson Moses:

| No. | Statements                                                                 | Students |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         | Total |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
|     |                                                                          | A | SA | D | SD | A | SA | D | SD | A | SA | D | SD | A | SA | D | SD |       |       |       |
| 1.  | Well read person.                                                        | 40 | 40 | 20 | 0  | 40 | 46 | 14 | 0   | 30 | 60 | 0  | 10 | 39.09 | 43.63 | 16.36 | 0.90 |
| 2.  | Sincere and honest to his assignments.                                   | 41.4 | 57.1 | 1.4 | 0  | 40 | 53.3 | 6.6 | 0   | 40 | 60 | 0  | 0   | 40.90 | 56.36 | 2.72  | 0    |
| 3.  | Pragmatist.                                                              | 31.4 | 37.1 | 31.4 | 0  | 36.6 | 50 | 3.3 | 10   | 50 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 34.54 | 39.09 | 21.81 | 3.63 |
| 4.  | Created opening and trusting climate.                                    | 31.4 | 44.2 | 24.2 | 0  | 30 | 43.3 | 20 | 6.6 | 40 | 40 | 20 | 0   | 31.81 | 40.90 | 22.72 | 4.54 |
| 5.  | Retirement had not diminished his enthusiasm to promote physical education and sports. | 42.8 | 52.8 | 4.2 | 0  | 33.3 | 40 | 20 | 6.6 | 40 | 30 | 30 | 0   | 40 | 47.27 | 10.90 | 1.81 |
| 6.  | Had pleasing manner.                                                    | 44.2 | 44.2 | 0   | 11.4 | 33.3 | 46.6 | 13.3 | 6.6 | 40 | 50 | 10 | 0   | 40.90 | 45.45 | 4.54  | 9.09 |
| 7.  | Believed in Scientific approach towards physical education.              | 37.1 | 51.4 | 11.4 | 0  | 26.6 | 66.6 | 6.6 | 0   | 20 | 80 | 0  | 0   | 32.72 | 58.18 | 9.09  | 0    |
| 8.  | Published articles in national and international journals.              | 30 | 37.1 | 32.8 | 0   | 13.3 | 63.3 | 3.3 | 20   | 10 | 50 | 40 | 0   | 26.36 | 45.45 | 25.45 | 2.72 |
| 9.  | Wrote books in physical education.                                       | 20 | 28 | 42 | 10 | 10 | 13.3 | 53.3 | 23.3 | 0 | 10 | 70 | 20 | 19.54 | 22.72 | 43.63 | 14.54 |
| 10. | Prepared projects judiciously.                                          | 25.7 | 41.4 | 22.8 | 10 | 33.3 | 50 | 10 | 6.6 | 20 | 70 | 10 | 0   | 27.27 | 46.36 | 18.18 | 8.18 |
| 11. | Possessed an excellent convincing power.                                | 32.8 | 41.4 | 24.2 | 1.4 | 30 | 56.6 | 3.3 | 10   | 20 | 60 | 20 | 0   | 30.90 | 47.27 | 18.18 | 3.53 |
| 12. | Explained vividly by giving appropriate examples.                       | 31.4 | 44.2 | 24.2 | 0   | 30 | 33.3 | 30 | 6.6 | 40 | 40 | 20 | 0   | 31.81 | 70.90 | 22.72 | 4.54 |
| 13. | Innovative.                                                             | 28 | 46 | 20.9 | 5.7 | 33.3 | 40 | 16.6 | 10   | 50 | 40 | 10 | 0   | 40.90 | 40 | 16.81 | 1.36 |
| 14. | Initiated publications in physical education.                            | 27.1 | 32.8 | 38.5 | 1.4 | 16.6 | 40 | 40 | 3.3 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 10 | 22.72 | 33.63 | 40.90 | 2.72 |
| 15. | Encouraged physical educators to acquire research degrees.              | 35.7 | 45.7 | 18.5 | 0   | 23.3 | 73.3 | 3.3 | 0   | 20 | 80 | 0  | 0   | 30.90 | 56.36 | 12.72 | 0    |
ROBSON'S SCHOLARLY QUALITIES:

The opinion of various physical educationists and sports persons on the scholarly qualities of Robson Moses have been given in Table – 3.

Table – 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 40% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% disagreed that Robson was a well-read person.

Among 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 46% strongly agreed, 14% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further state that majority 86% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 14% disagreed that Robson was a well read person.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority 90% either agreed or
disagreed, whereas only 10% strongly disagreed that Robson was a well read person.

The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 39.09% agreed, 43.63% strongly agreed, 16.36% disagreed and 0.90% strongly disagreed that Robson was a well read person. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 32.
Fig. 32 Well read person
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 41.4% agreed, 57.1% strongly agreed, 1.4% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 98.5% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 1.4% disagreed that Robson was sincere and honest to his assignments.

Among 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 53.3% strongly agreed, 6.6% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further state that majority 93.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 6.6% disagreed that Robson was sincere and honest to his assignments.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that all the contemporaries agree or strongly agreed that Robson was sincere and honest to his assignments.
The response of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 40.90% agreed, 56.36% strongly agreed, 2.72% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed that Robson is sincere and honest to his assignments. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 33.
Fig. 33 Sincere and honest to his assignments.
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 31.4% agreed, 37.1% strongly agreed, 31.4% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 68.5% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 31.4% disagreed that Robson was pragmatist.

Among 30 colleagues, 36.6% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 3.3% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicate that majority 86.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 13.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was pragmatist.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 70% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was pragmatist.

The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 34.54% agreed, 39.09% strongly agreed, 21.81% disagreed and 3.63% strongly disagreed that Robson was pragmatist. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 34.
Fig. 34 Pragmatist.
Table – 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 31.4% agreed, 44.2% strongly agreed, 24.2% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 75.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 24.4% disagreed that Robson created opening and trusting climate.

Among 30 colleagues, 30% agreed, 43.3% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further shows that majority 73.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 26.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson created opening and trusting climate.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 20% disagreed that Robson created opening and trusting climate.

The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 31.81%
agree, 40.90% strongly agree, 22.72% disagree and 4.54% strongly disagree that Robson created opening and trusting climate. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 35.
Fig. 35 Created opening and trusting climate.
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 42.8% agreed, 52.8% strongly agreed, 4.2% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 95.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 4.2% disagreed that Robson retirement had not diminished his enthusiasm to promote Physical Education and Sports.

Among 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further shows that majority 73.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 26.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson retirement had not diminished his enthusiasm to promote Physical Education and Sports.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 70% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 30% disagreed that Robson retirement had not diminished his enthusiasm to promote Physical Education and Sports.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 40% agreed, 47.27% strongly agreed, 10.90% disagreed and 1.81% strongly disagreed that Robson retirement had not diminished his enthusiasm to promote Physical Education and Sports. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 36.
Fig. 36 Retirement had not diminished his enthusiasm to promote Physical Education and Sports
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 44.2% agreed, 44.2% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 11.4% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 88.4% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 11.4% disagreed that Robson had pleasing manners.

Among 30 colleagues, 33.3% agree, 46.6% strongly agreed, 13.3% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further shows that majority 79.9% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 19.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson had pleasing manners.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that majority 90% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 10% disagreed that Robson had pleasing manners.

The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 40.90% agreed, 45.45% strongly agreed, 4.54% disagreed and 0.09% strongly disagreed that Robson had pleasing manners. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 37.
Fig. 37 Had Pleasing manners
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 37.1% agreed, 51.4% strongly agreed, 11.4% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 88.5% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 11.4% disagreed that Robson believed in scientific approach towards Physical Education.

Out of 30 colleagues, 26.6% agreed, 66.6% strongly agreed, 6.6% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 93.2% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 6.6% disagreed that Robson believed in scientific approach towards Physical Education.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 80% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table reveals clearly that entire 100% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson believed in scientific approach towards Physical Education.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 32.72% agreed, 58.18% strongly agreed, 9.09% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed that Robson believed in scientific approach towards Physical Education. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 38.
Fig. 38 Believed in scientific approach towards Physical Education
Table – 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 30% agreed, 37.1% strongly agreed, 32.8% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 67.1% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 32.8% disagreed that Robson published articles in National and International Journals.

Out of 30 colleagues, 13.3% agreed, 63.3% strongly agreed, 3.3% disagreed and 20% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 76.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 23.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson published articles in National and International Journals.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table reveals that majority 60% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 40% disagreed that Robson published articles in National and International Journals.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 26.36% agreed, 45.45% strongly agreed, 25.45% disagreed and 2.72% strongly disagreed that Robson published articles in National and International Journals. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 39.
Fig. 39 Published articles in National and International journals
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 20% agreed, 28% strongly agreed, 42% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 52% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 48% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson wrote books in Physical Education.

Out of 30 colleagues, 10% agreed, 13.3% strongly agreed, 53.3% disagreed and 23.3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 76.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 23.3% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson wrote books in Physical Education.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 0% agreed, 10% strongly agreed, 70% disagreed and 20% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 10% strongly agreed that Robson wrote books in Physical Education.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 19.54% agreed, 22.72% strongly agreed, 43.63% disagreed and 14.54% strongly disagreed that Robson wrote books in Physical Education. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 40.
Fig. 40 Wrote books in Physical Education
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 25.7% agreed, 41.4% strongly agreed, 22.8% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 67.1% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 32.8% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson prepared projects judiciously.

Out of 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority either 83.3% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 16.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson prepared projects judiciously.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 70% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson prepared projects judiciously.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 27.27% agreed, 46.36% strongly agreed, 18.18% disagreed and 8.18% strongly disagreed that Robson prepared projects judiciously. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 41.
Fig. 41 Prepared Projects judiciously
Table – 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 32.8% agreed, 41.4% strongly agreed, 24.2% disagreed and 1.4% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 74.2% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 25.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson possessed an excellent convincing power.

Out of 30 colleagues, 30% agreed, 56.6% strongly agreed, 3.3% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 86.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 13.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson possessed an excellent convincing power.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% disagreed that Robson possessed an excellent convincing power.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 30.90% agreed, 47.27% strongly agreed, 18.18% disagreed and 3.63% strongly disagreed that Robson possessed an excellent convincing power. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 42.
Fig. 42 Possessed an excellent convincing power
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 31.4% agreed, 44.2% strongly agreed, 24.2% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 75.6% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 24.2% disagreed that Robson explained vividly by giving appropriate examples.

Out of 30 colleagues, 30% agreed, 33.3% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table reveals that majority 63.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 36.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson explained vividly by giving appropriate examples.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 40% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% disagreed that Robson explained vividly by giving appropriate examples.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 31.81% agreed, 40.90% strongly agreed, 22.72% disagreed and 5.54% strongly disagreed that Robson explained vividly by giving appropriate examples. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 43.
Fig. 43 Explained vividly giving appropriate examples.
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 28% agreed, 46% strongly agreed, 20.9% disagreed and 5% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 74% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 25.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was innovative.

Out of 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 16.6% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table reveals that majority 73.3% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 26.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was innovative.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson was innovative.

The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 40.90% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 16.81% disagreed and 1.36% strongly disagreed that Robson was innovative. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 44.
Fig. 44 Was Innovative
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 27.1% agreed, 32.8% strongly agreed, 38.5% disagreed and 1.4% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 59.9% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 39.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson initiated publications in Physical Education.

Out of 30 colleagues, 16.6% agree, 40% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 56.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 43.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson initiated publications in Physical Education.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 20% strongly agreed, 60% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 70% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 30% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson initiated publications in Physical Education.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 22.72% agreed, 33.63% strongly agreed, 40.90% disagreed and 2.72% strongly disagreed that Robson initiated publications in Physical Education. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 45.
Fig. 45 Initiated publications in Physical Education
Table - 3 indicates that out of 70 students, 35.7% agreed, 45.7% strongly agreed, 18.5% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 81.4% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 18.5% disagreed that Robson encouraged Physical Educators to acquire research degrees.

Out of 30 colleagues, 23.3% agreed, 73.3% strongly agreed, 3.3% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 96.6% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 3.3% disagreed that Robson encouraged Physical Educators to acquire research degrees.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 20% agree, 80% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that all of 100% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas no one disagreed that Robson encouraged Physical Educators to acquire research degrees.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 30.90% agreed, 56.36% strongly agreed, 12.72% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged Physical Educators to acquire research degrees. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 46.
Fig. 46 Encouraged Physical Educators to acquire research degrees
The opinion of various Physical Educationists and Sports Persons on the Teaching Qualities of

Robson Moses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>Contemporaries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A good conversationalist.</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Punctual for his classes.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Did not showed inclination or favour.</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Remained eager to take his classes.</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Employed variation in his teaching style.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>His classes were interesting and inspiring.</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Involved students in formulation and implementation of plans.</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gave adequate freedom to students for new ideas.</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Provided atmosphere for creative work.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Imparted concreteness to educational planning.</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Employed audio-visual aids.</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Provided suitable examples related to the topic.</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Encouraged discussions among the students.</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Encouraged students to make maximum use of library.</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Evaluated assignments and answer books promptly.</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROBSON'S TEACHING QUALITIES:

The opinion of various Physical Educationists and Sports Persons on the Teaching Qualities of Robson Moses have been given in Table - 4.

Table - 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 35.7% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 14.2% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 85.7% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 14.2% disagreed that Robson was a good conversationalist.

Among 30 colleagues, 43.3% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 6.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 83.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 16.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was a good conversationalist.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly
agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson was a good conversationalist.

The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 37.27% agreed, 48.18% strongly agreed, 12.72% disagreed and 1.81% strongly disagreed that Robson was a good conversationalist. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 47.
Fig. 47 A good conversationalist
Table 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 40% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 100% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas no one either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was punctual for his classes.

Among 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 63.3% strongly agreed, 3.3% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 96.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 3.3% only disagreed that Robson was punctual for his classes.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 80% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 100% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas no one either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson was punctual for his classes.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 36.36% agreed, 62.72% strongly agreed, 0.90% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed that Robson was punctual for his classes. The data pertaining to this is presented in Fig – 48.
Fig. 48 Punctual for his classes
Table - 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 27.1% agreed, 58.5% strongly agreed, 2.2% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 85.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 14.2% disagreed that Robson did not showed inclination or favour.

Among 30 colleagues, 26.6% agreed, 66.6% strongly agreed, 6.6% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also indicate that majority 93.2% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 6.6% disagreed that Robson did not showed inclination or favour.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 0% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 60% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 70% either disagreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 30% strongly agreed that Robson did not showed inclination or favour.

The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 27.27% agreed, 60.90% strongly agreed, 11.81% disagreed and 0% disagreed that Robson did not showed inclination or favour. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 49.
Fig. 49 Did not showed any inclination or favour
Table – 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 45.7% agreed, 54.3% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 100% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas no one either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson remained eager to take his classes.

Among 30 colleagues, 30% agreed, 63.3% strongly agreed, 3.3% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 93.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 6.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson remained eager to take his classes.

Out of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson remained eager to take his classes.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 39.09% agreed, 57.27% strongly agreed, 1.81% disagreed and 1.81% strongly disagreed that Robson remained eager to take his classes. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure 50.
Fig. 50 Remained eager to take his classes
Table – 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 40% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 20% disagreed, 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 80% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% disagreed that Robson employed variation in his teaching style.

Out of 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 33.3% strongly agreed, 13.3% disagreed and 13.3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 73.3% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 26.6% disagreed that Robson employed variation in his teaching style.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 60% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagree that Robson employed variation in his teaching style.

The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 41.81%
agreed, 37.27% strongly agreed, 17.27% disagreed and 3.63% strongly disagreed that Robson employed variation in his teaching style. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 51.
Fig. 51 Employed variations in teaching style
Table - 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 38.5% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 11.4% disagreed, 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 88.5% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 11.4% disagreed that Robson's classes were interesting and inspiring.

Out of 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 16.6% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 80% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 19.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson's classes were interesting and inspiring.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 50% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 80% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 20% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson's classes were interesting and inspiring.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 38.18% agreed, 47.27% strongly agreed, 12.72% disagreed and 1.81% strongly disagreed that Robson's classes were interesting and inspiring. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 52.
Fig. 52 His classes were interesting and inspiring
Table - 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 37.1% agreed, 45.7% strongly agreed, 17.1% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 82.8% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 17.1% disagreed that Robson involved students in formulation and implementation of plans.

Out of 30 colleagues, 30% agreed, 16.6% strongly agreed, 33.3% disagreed and 20% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 53.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 46.6% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson involved students in formulation and implementation of plans.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 10% agreed, 20% strongly agreed, 60% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 70% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 30% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson involved students in formulation and implementation of plans.
The response of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 32.72% agreed, 35.45% strongly agreed, 25.45% disagreed and 6.36% strongly disagreed that Robson involved students in formulation and implementation of plans. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 53.
Fig. 53 Involved students in formulation and implementation of plans
Table - 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 37.1% agreed, 28.5% strongly agreed, 34.2% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 65.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 34.2% disagreed that Robson gave adequate freedom to students for new ideas.

Out of 30 colleagues, 13.3% agreed, 23.3% strongly agreed, 50% disagreed and 13.3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 63.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 36.6% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson gave adequate freedom to students for new ideas.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 5% agreed, 5% strongly agreed, 60% disagreed and 30% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 10% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson gave adequate freedom to students for new ideas.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 28.18% agreed, 25.25% strongly agreed, 40.90% disagreed and 6.36% strongly disagreed that Robson gave adequate freedom to students for new ideas. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 54.
Fig. 54 Gave adequate freedom to students for new ideas
Table - 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 42% agreed, 35% strongly agreed, 23% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicated that majority 77% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 23% disagreed that Robson provided atmosphere for creative work.

Out of 30 colleagues, 26.6% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 30% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 66.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 33.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson provided atmosphere for creative work.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson provided atmosphere for creative work.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 37.27% agreed, 39.09% strongly agreed, 22.72% disagreed and 0.90% strongly disagreed that Robson provided atmosphere for creative work. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 55.
Fig. 55 Provided atmosphere for creative work
Table - 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 32.8% agreed, 48.5% strongly agreed, 18.5% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 81.3% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 18.5% disagreed that Robson imparted concreteness to educational Planning.

Out of 30 colleagues, 30% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 6.6% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 9.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson imparted concreteness to educational Planning.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 50% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 10% either disagreed that Robson imparted concreteness to educational Planning.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 33.63% agreed, 50.90% strongly agreed, 14.54% disagreed and 0.90% strongly disagreed that Robson imparted concreteness to educational Planning. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 56.
Fig. 56 Imparted concerteness to educational planning
Table – 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 25.7% agreed, 32.8% strongly agreed, 37.1% disagreed and 4.2% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 58.5% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 41.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson employed audio-visual aids.

Out of 30 colleagues, 6.6% agreed, 23.3% strongly agreed, 60% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 70% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 29.9% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson employed audio-visual aids.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 50% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 50% contemporaries agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 50% disagreed that Robson employed audio-visual aids.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 20% agreed, 30% strongly agreed, 44.54% disagreed and 5.45% strongly disagreed that Robson employed audio-visual aids. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure - 57.
Fig. 57 Employed audio visual aids
Table - 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 44.2% agreed, 40% strongly agreed, 15.7% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 84.2% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 15.7% disagreed that Robson provided suitable examples related to topic.

Out of 30 colleagues, 40% agreed, 47% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 87% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 13% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson provided suitable examples related to topic.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 30% agreed, 60% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed whereas only 10% strongly disagreed that Robson provided suitable examples related to topic.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 39.09% agreed, 46.36% strongly agreed, 12.72% disagreed and 1.81% strongly disagreed that Robson provided suitable examples related to topic. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 58.
Fig. 58 Provided suitable example related to the topic
Table – 4 indicates that out of 70 students 25.7% agreed, 45.7% strongly agreed, 28.5% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 71.4% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 28.5% disagreed that Robson encouraged discussions among the students.

Out of 30 colleagues, 20% agreed, 13.3% strongly agreed, 40% disagreed and 26.6% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 66.6% either disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas 23.3% either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson encouraged discussions among the students.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 70% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 10% strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged discussions among the students.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 24.54% agreed, 36.36% strongly agreed, 30.90% disagreed and 9.09% strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged discussions among the students. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 59.
Fig. 59 Encouraged discussions among the students
Table – 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 34.2% agreed, 58.5% strongly agreed, 7.1% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 92.7% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 7.1% disagreed that Robson encouraged students to make maximum use of library.

Out of 30 colleagues, 23.3% agreed, 63.3% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. Table also reveals that majority 86.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 13.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged students to make maximum use of library.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 70% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 90% either agreed or strongly agreed whereas only 10% disagreed that Robson encouraged students to make maximum use of library.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 30% agreed, 60.90% strongly agreed, 8.18% disagreed and 0.90% strongly disagreed that Robson encouraged students to make maximum use of library. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 60.
Fig. 60 Encouraged students to make maximum use of library
Table – 4 indicates that out of 70 students, 48.5% agreed, 47.1% strongly agreed, 4.2% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 95.6% agreed or strongly agreed, whereas only 4.2% disagreed that Robson evaluated assignments and answer books promptly.

Out of 30 colleagues, 33.3% agreed, 53.3% strongly agreed, 10% disagreed and 3.3% strongly disagreed. Table further reveals that majority 86.6% either agreed or strongly agreed, whereas 13.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that Robson evaluated assignments and answer books promptly.

Among of 10 contemporaries, 20% agreed, 80% strongly agreed, 0% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed. Table further indicates that 100% contemporaries either agreed or strongly agreed that Robson evaluated assignments and answer books promptly.
The responses of the students, colleagues and contemporaries taken together points out that 41.18% agreed, 51.81% strongly agreed, 5.45% disagreed and 0.90% strongly disagreed that Robson evaluated assignments and answer books promptly. The data pertaining to this is presented in Figure – 61.
**Fig. 61** Evaluated assignments and answer books promptly
Discussion of Hypothesis

Based upon the study the hypothesis formulated in chapter one with respect to students, colleagues, contemporaries and eminent Physical educationists have been accepted.