"The art of creative leader is the art of institution-building. . . . . . ."

- Selznick (1937)
2.1 Introduction

The present research attempts to study the role of leadership in institution building. In other words, its emphasis is on the impact of leadership actions on institution building.

To understand the relationship between a leader and an institution, it is necessary to understand both growth and functional aspects of a leader or an institution-builder as well as institution building as a process. Elsewhere in this thesis an attempt has been made to understand the leadership growth and functions and a comprehensive review of relevant leadership studies. In this chapter a review of relevant institution-building studies has been attempted.

This chapter consists of the following sections:


2.2 Institution

It is necessary to understand and define an institution before one thinks of institution-building process. A number of eminent sociologists and social scientists have attempted to define institution.
Schneider (1964, p.33S) described:

"The term denotes an aspect of social life in which distinctive value-orientations and interests, centering upon large and important social phenomena (e.g., education, marriage, property) generate or are accompanied by distinctive modes of social actions. Its use emphasizes "important" social phenomena, relationships of 'strategic structural significance'."

Schneider's emphasis is on 'value-orientations', while Etzioni (1964, p.3) faced a confusion.

"Institution is sometimes used to refer to certain types of organizations. Sometimes institution refers to a quite different phenomenon, namely, to a normative principle that culturally defines behaviour, such as marriage or property. Because of these two conflicting usages, this term has probably caused more confusion than formal organization and bureaucracy together. All three might well be avoided in favour of the simple term, organization."

Hans Blaise's (1964, p.9) definition of institution is close to Etzioni's (1964) concept of organization.

"Organizations which embody, foster and protect normative relationship and action patterns and perform functions and services which are valued in the environment."

But the confusion faced by Etzioni (1964) still remains. Selznick (1957, p.17) distinguishes institutions from organizations. According to Selznick (1957, p.17) institutions are more enduring, have a social impact and embody a value.
"In what is perhaps its most significant meaning, 'to institutionalise' is to infuse with value beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand. The prizing of social machinery beyond its technical role is largely a reflection of the unique way in which it fulfills personal or group needs. Whether individuals become attached to an organization or a way of doing things as persons rather than as technicians, the result is a prizing of the device for its own sake. From the standpoint of the committed person, the organization is changed from an expendable tool into a valued source of personal satisfaction.

A number of definitions come from various scholars from behavioural and social sciences to link institutions with development process. Phillips (1969, p.20) described institution as:

"The term 'institution', as used in this work, refers to organizations staffed with personnel capable of carrying out defined, but evolving, programs contributing to social and economic development and having enough continuing resources to assure a sustained effort for establishment, acceptance, and application of new methods and values."

Uphoff (1971, p.23) described:

"To the extent that an organization succeeds over time in demonstrating the value of its functions and having them accepted by others as important and significant, the organization acquires the status of an 'institution'."

Duncan and Pooler (1972, p.183-184) described institutions as means of social change:
"They are specific formal organizations which over time have developed a capacity to act as agents for the larger society by providing valued functions and services. More than this, they serve as models for defining legitimate normative and value patterns, conserving and protecting them for the larger society. In dealing with the problem of how to introduce innovative techniques in developing societies, we assume that an effective way to do this is by creating and supporting formal organizations which utilize these innovations and corresponding technology in such a manner that over time, given changes in the existing institutional complex of the society, these organizations take on the mantle of institutions."

Esman (1969, p.22) defined institution as "a new or remodeled organization which induces, and protects innovations." Ashby (1966, p.3) defined an institution as "the embodiment of an ideal." Goodenough (1963, p.344) defined an institution as:

"The recipes, stockpiles, materials and social arrangements, and schedules to which people commit themselves acquire value as ends in themselves. Alternatives are devalued accordingly. These publicly valued procedures and arrangements to which such commitment has been made, and all of the things associated with them make up a community's institutions."

Blaise (1964) found three common elements from various definitions of institutions, namely, (1) institutions as prescribers of norms or behavior (2) their degree of regularity and relative permanance independent of individual actors, and (3) their applicability to both a small group as well as an entire society."
Uphoff (1971) mentioned:

"an organization becomes an institution when it demonstrates the value of its functions over time and others accept them as important and significant. In the process, the organization becomes more stable and secure, more capable of performing its functions, and ensures that its rising productivity is incorporated into the society's 'regular' activities and beliefs."

Scholars like Hagen (1962) and Eisenstadt (1965) discussed the role of elites in bringing about social change. Eisenstadt is aware that identifying needs of society does not lead us towards creation of an institution. Various scholars have, thus, attempted to define the concept of institution and also differentiate the words institution and organization in different contexts. But the common element emerging from all these different interpretations is the focus on the embodiment of values and their acceptance by the society.

In other words, an organization becomes an institution and sustains its institutionality through a dynamic response to the circumstances. According to Selznick (1957) institutionalization means 'to infuse with values'. And, therefore, it is the responsibility of an institution-builder to translate the values through his vision into a purposeful mission to create an institution for the social change. Mathai (1977), Ganesh (1973, 1979) and Pareek (1981) identify the need of processes in institution-building.

2.3 Institution-building

It was during mid 60's that attempts were made to evolve a theoretical framework of institution-building. These attempts were directed to help
both institution-builders as well as economic aid agencies. The outcome of these attempts was some guidelines to provide economic assistance to the developing countries and to serve as a conceptual framework to institution-builders. The new stream of institution-building and institutionalization process have, therefore, attracted a variety of academicians and professionals from various branches of social sciences and behavioural sciences. However, institution-building emerged as a discipline only during mid 60's.

The USA started offering financial aid to the developing countries through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). There was a need to formulate the aid criteria or to define guidelines for the USAID. In other words, the primary need was to develop a common framework to formulate a policy to assist developing countries.

As a result of a collaborative effort of a group of American scholars from the Universities of Pittsburgh, Michigan State, Indiana, and Syracuse a common framework of institution-building was formulated for the USAID. This collaborative effort, coordinated by Esman, was made under a programme known as the Inter University Research Programme of Institution Building (IURP-IB). These scholars were either engaged or had experiences in developmental projects or in the training of development experts in developing countries.

Esman (1972, p.22) defined institution-building as an outcome of the IURP-IB project as:

"Institution Building may be defined as the planning, structuring, and guidance of new or reconstituted organizations which (a) embody changes in values, functions, physical and/or social technologies, (b) establish, foster and protect new normative relationships and
and action patterns, and (c) obtain support and complementarity in the environment."

Uphoff (1971, p.24) described IB as:

"An institution is more than a cultural pattern. It attracts support and legitimacy from its environment so that it can better perform its functions and services. This is the essential dynamic of Institution-Building."

**IURP-IB Model (Table-1, p. 24)**

The common framework of IB emerged out of the collaborative effort of IURP-IB and was presented by Esman and Bruhns (1966, p. 324-325).

Some basic characteristics of the model are:

a. Development, or more modestly, social change, and the concomitant new values, functions, technologies and action patterns, cannot be effectively introduced and sustained in transitional societies unless they are embedded in a supportive network of social structures, processes and norms. In short, these innovative values, functions and technologies must be institutionalized.

b. The process takes place in and through institutional organizations which must either be newly created or adapted and restructured for this purpose.

c. Institutional development need not be a 'natural' or evolutionary process which occurs independently of human design. In this era, new technologies and new institutional forms are almost everywhere deliberately induced and directed. This sense of deliberate human
purpose and human direction warrants the use of the phrase "institution building" and suggests a key role for modernizing elites.

d. Institution building is thus an approach to the development process which relies heavily on the concept of "social engineering", and which stresses the leadership functions of modernizing elite group within that process and the alternative action strategies available to them.

e. As development occurs, social functions on technologies become increasingly specialised. With specialization, interdependencies develop. The institutions incorporating innovations are thus involved in a network of complementary and competing relationships in their environment on which institution-building research must focus.

f. Institution building is conceived of as a generic social process. There are elements and actions that can be identified as generally relevant to institution-building, even though their expression will differ depending on the type of institution and the social environment.

g. It is possible, through systematic and comparative analysis of institution-building experiences, to derive a technology of institution building that will be useful to persons engaged in introducing innovation into developing societies, whether they be indigenous change agents or foreign advisors.

There is a close similarity between institution building perspective and Eisenstadt's (1963) studies of political systems of centralised empires especially in terms of their macro-system focus.
The institution-building model, emerged out of UNDP-IB project has three sets of variables for the practical use of the institution builders. They are:

1. "Organizational" variables,
2. "Inter-Organizational" variables, and
3. "Exchange" or "transactional" relationships.

### The Institution-Building Universe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctrine</td>
<td>Transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table-1

Source: Esman (1972).

1. "Organizational" variables consist of:
   - (a) Leadership
   - (b) Doctrine
   - (c) Program
   - (d) Resources
   - (e) Internal Structure

2. The "Inter-organizational" variables consist of four types of linkages:
   - (a) Enabling linkages
   - (b) Functional linkages
   - (c) Normative linkages
   - (d) Diffused linkages

3. The "Exchange" or "Transactions" relationships consist of:
   - (a) Gaining support and overcome resistance
   - (b) Exchange of resources
   - (c) Structuring the environment
   - (d) Transfer of norms and values.
Esman (1972, p.22-24) interpreted these three concepts as under:

1. "Leadership refers to the group of persons who are actively engaged in the formulation of the doctrine and program of the institution and who direct its operations and relationships with the environment."

   "The leadership group comprises both the holders of formally designated leadership positions and others who exercise important continuing influence over the institution's activities."

2. "Doctrine is defined as the specification of values, objectives, and operational methods underlying social action."

3. "Program refers to those actions which are related to the performance of functions and services constituting the output of the institution."

4. "Resources are the financial, physical, human, technological and informational inputs of the institution."

5. "Internal structure is defined as the structure and processes established for the operation of the institution and for its maintenance."

6. Enabling linkages are "with organizations and social groups which control the allocation of authority and resources needed by the institution to function."

7. Functional linkages are "with those organizations performing functions and services which are complementary in a production sense, which supply the inputs and which use the outputs of the institution. In a sense these are the "forward" and "backward" linkages."
8. Normative linkages are "with institutions which incorporate norms and values (positive or negative) which are relevant to the doctrine and program of the institution."

9. Diffused linkages are "with elements in the society which cannot clearly be identified by membership in formal organization."

The institution-building model achieves 'institutionality' as the end-state. And to achieve this 'end-state' it is necessary to emphasise the various 'exchange' relationships or transactions which link an institution with its environment.

Esman (1972, p.36) interpreted 'institutionality' as the 'end-state' as under:

1. Technical capacity: the ability to deliver technical services which are innovations to the society at an increasing level of competence;

2. Normative commitments: the extent to which the innovative ideas, relationships, and practices for which the organization stands have been internalised by its staff;

3. Innovative thrust: the ability of the institution to continue to innovate so that new technologies and behaviour patterns which it introduces may not be frozen in their original form, but the institution can continually learn and adapt to new technological and political opportunities;

4. Environmental image: the extent to which the institution is valued or favorably regarded in the society; this can be demonstrated by its ability to (a) acquire resources without paying a high price in its change objective, (b) operate in ways that deviate from traditional patterns, (c) defend itself against attack and criticism, (d) influence
decisions in its functional areas, and (e) enlarge and expand its sphere of action.

5. Spread effect: the degree to which innovative technologies, norms, or behaviour patterns for which the institution stands have been taken up and integrated into the on-going activities of other organizations.

Scope and Limitations

Siffin (1972) described the IB model as:

(1) Static  (2) a priori  (3) unoriented and (4) prescriptive. According to Siffin (1972) it does not clearly indicate the relationship between these elements and it does not identify the role of each element. Its staticness indicates that it excludes time factor. Nehnevajsa (1972) considers time factor as one of the most important variables in institution building process.

According to Siffin (1972, p.46-47):

"Institution building is not a theory (save in the loosest and most metaphorical sense of that much maligned word). One useful conventional conceptualization of a theory is that of "an empirical generalization" - a general statement of some regular, predictable relationships between two or more types of things. If institution-building were an empirical theory, it would necessarily include indices of "institutionalization" - the discrete state or condition that is intended to "be attained through a certain quality of intervention. But the IB literature is not clear and precise on this point. It offers a deliberate set of stipulations, along with some latitude for choice. In the absence of a clear and unequivocal index of the state to be achieved by the appropriate interaction of the variables, it
is rather obviously impossible to subject the theory of the test of validation - or falsification."

Another important limitation of this model is that it does not indicate the follow-up actions to achieve the stage of institutionality. Ganesh (1980, p.216) identified a limitation of IB model:

"Except for Esman's statement that IB is concerned only with non-coercive means, it has no built-in criteria for the choice of one set of values and norms over another."

Crowfoot and Chester (1974) identified three approaches:

1. the Professional - Technical Approach
2. the Political Approach
3. the Countercultural Approach. Crowfoot and Chester (1974) attempt to understand these approaches with four basic questions:

1. What are its general images of the society?
2. What are its general images of the individual?
3. What are its diagnoses of contemporary society? and
4. What are its priorities with regard to change?

Esman (1972, p.28) answered these questions as under:

"The three main change processes are technological, cultural and political. Cultural or normative methods rely on efforts to change individual or group values, attitudes, or role perceptions using ideological indoctrinative, emotional, symbolic, group dynamic, and other sub-cognitive methods. Technological methods rely on cognitive information or on new practices or services to induce fresh action patterns and intellectual commitments to changed roles and activities. Political methods rely on the redistribution of power, redefinition of rewards, manipulation of resources, or the use of influence and
and bargaining to produce behavioural change. In any major IE effort all three methods must be used in a variety of sequences and combinations."

Ganesh (1980, p.217) explained this phenomenon:

"The IB model confirms more closely to the assumptions of the Political Approach. This approach views society as a network of groups, each with shared values and interests of its own. This engenders competition and conflict over various resources, which are in turn governed by the distribution of power among the different groups. Distribution of power is uneven in that a few individuals or groups are in control. With the elitists the concern is one of creating new laws, norms, and other interaction patterns to increase their control. Therefore, by taking an elitist view, the IB model necessarily delimits its concerns. Although Esman has time and again emphasized the noncoercive stance of the model, there is no explicit concern with redistribution of power in the society nor, as would be the case in a countercultural perspective, any concern with maximal welfare —— this is mostly due to the instrumental nature of the IB model."

This criticism also identifies some weakness in the method of looking at the model with political approach. This is due to the issues of power distribution among groups and that is directly concerned with the command and control.

In the above section the IB model developed by Esman and others and its limitations are discussed in detail. In the next section a similar exercise
with the general processual model developed by Ganesh (1978, 1979) will be attempted.

**General Processual Model of IB**

Another major attempt to evolve an IB model was made by Ganesh (1978, 1979). Ganesh (1978, 1979) developed a General Processual Model of Institution Building from his study of six management education institutions in India. This study seems to be more meaningful as well as more relevant to the present study as it has emerged out of empirical investigations. It highlights implications for planned change at macro system (social change) and micro system (organizational change) levels.


Capability development of an institution can be measured with three factors, viz., changes in faculty, changes in funds, and changes in facilities. In other words, these changes are in terms of the resource position of an institution. Similarly, performance indicators for innovative thrust and penetration largely depend upon conventional output measures, viz., changes in participants and students; the number of programmes offered including major innovations like new postgraduate programmes, sectorwise representation of participants in executive development programmes etc.
FOUR CATEGORIES OF PROCESSES OF INSTITUTION BUILDING (G.P.M.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Processes</th>
<th>Development Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incubation</td>
<td>Culture Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception</td>
<td>Boundary Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Idea origination and nurturance
1. Choice of model
2. Choice of institutional form
2. Choice of early leadership
3. Location
3. Resource mobilization
4. Support mobilization
5. Leadership style

2. Recruitment
2. Enculturation
2. Maintenance
3. Decision making
3. Enlargement
4. Structure
4. Shrinkage
5. Leadership style

3. Renewal Processes

4. Institutionalization Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance Building</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Change in leadership</td>
<td>1. Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regeneration</td>
<td>1. Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>2. Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>2. Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redefinition of mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure - 1

Source: Ganesh (1990, p.223)
The process mechanism consists of four main processes: (see Figure 1, p. 31)

1. Birth process
2. Development process
3. Renewal process
4. Institutionalization process.

Each process has several sub-processes which ultimately result in the development of an institution.

The GPM of IB is relevant to the present study because 1. process mechanism helps to understand the growth of an institution at various stages, and 2. it helps to study the role of leadership and impact of leadership actions on IB during its growth.

Ganesh (1979) identified the role of leadership in three IB processes during the growth of an institution: 'choice of leadership' in the birth processes, 'leadership style' in the development processes, and 'change in leadership' in the renewal processes.

The main objective of evolving such a model is to help institution builders to create institutions. The systematic approach in formulation of the GPM of IB will certainly guide the institution builder to understand various processes and sub-processes of IB at different stages of the development of an institution and will also enable him to clarify various needs during the growth of the institution.

2.4 Role of leadership and impact of leadership actions on institution building

In the previous section two major attempts to evolve a model of institution building were discussed in detail. These two IB models can be helpful to institution builders in their tasks of creating institutions for social needs.
A number of IB studies (Hanson 1968), Blaise (1964), Nayar (1967) and Uphoff and Ilchman (1972) indicated that the role of leadership in institution building is most crucial as compared to other variables. Selznick (1957, p.152-153) described the role of leadership in IB: "The art of the creative leader is the art of institution-building, the reworking of human and technological materials to fashion an organism that embodies new and enduring values."

Hanson (1968, p.147) described the term leadership in his study of an African educational institution:

"... to refer to those persons who formulated the doctrine and program of the University and its College of Education, who directed their operations, and who were by virtue of office responsible for establishing relationships with the environment."

In other words, Hanson described the role of leadership in formulation of doctrine and program of the University and also in its proper implementation.

Blaise (1964, p.196-199) identified the following elements as determinants of the value of the leadership.

1. "Functional role — In short, the role or position of the leadership in the social structure bears on its channels of communication, its power and influence in the functional area and the environment —"

2. "Status — While functional role refers to the formal position in the hierarchy, status refers to the ascribed power and influence position —"
3. "Motivation — Beyond the actual motivation of the leadership we are also concerned with the motivations ascribed by the environment —"

4. "Functional competence — This refers to the technical competence in the functional area of the institution as it is represented in the leadership group —"

5. "Organization competence — By organization competence is meant what Harlan Cleveland has called 'a talent for combining personnel and resources into dynamic, self-sustaining enterprises' —"

6. "Role distribution — Which indicates whether the potentially available complementarity among the members of the leadership unit is in fact fully used —"

7. "Continuity — Without continuity in the leadership group there are likely to be changes in values and approaches which are detrimental to the consistent and systematic building of an institution. Besides, it hampers the development of the necessary competences and their applications to a given situation."

In short, what Blaise (1964, p.196-199) described is the organizational capacity, interacting with both internal as well as external environments, and group motivation of the leader.

Uphoff and Uchman (1972, p.9-11) described some aspects of institution builder as under: 
not simply the counterpart of homo economicus. He does not merely buy cheap and sell dear. Rather he is an entrepreneur, combining factors of organizational production in such a way as to produce valued outputs. These in turn yield him resources which may be used to further the process of organizational growth. He is one who has a canny sense both of his market opportunities and his own objectives. He finds new sources of resources and supports new combinations which are more productive, or new uses for them which yield greater values of output. The characteristic of leadership, then, which distinguishes it with success is an acute faculty for strategy, that is, the use of resources over time. A person occupying a position of authority who lacks a sense of the productivity of time may well squander or dissipate the resources which accrue to his position. Many persons in positions of authority have resources at their disposal. Yet often by neither seizing nor making opportunities for organizational growth they forfeit the possibility of strengthening the organization by increasing its outputs or increasing its inputs.

Thus Uphoff and Ichman (1972, p.9-11) described the involvement of a leader in various processes of institutional growth and they also strongly believe that the leader is responsible for implementation of policy and program as well as for the right outputs. Selznick (1957) mentioned the term Institutional Leader to consider it as a distinct form of leadership. Mc Clelland and Burnham (1976) mentioned the term institutional manager to differentiate it from a manager. They identified some characteristics of an institutional manager.
1. "He is more organization minded and thinks in terms of wider organization than personal objectives."

2. "He likes discipline in work habit and believes in getting things done in an orderly way and has a strong work ethic."

3. "He is willing to sacrifice self-interest for the welfare of the organization."

4. "He usually has a keen sense of justice and believes that a person who works hard must be rewarded."

5. "He is high in motivation like socialized power, altruism."

6. "He creates morale by creating clarity regarding goals and team-spirit."

The above mentioned characteristics do not throw any appreciable light on the subject; rather they portray utopian situation.

Selznick (1957) and Bennis (1982) emphasized the need of vision in institutional leadership and ability to translate it into reality. While Weber (1968) discussed the charismatic characteristic of a leader to inspire and guide people for the accomplishment of the necessary support.

In this section, I have tried to understand leadership taking into consideration definitions of institutional leadership by various scholars. Thus, we have now defined institutional leadership and its role in institution building. But one of the most important factors which is extremely relevant to the present study is the impact of leadership actions on institution-building.
Leadership actions

The role of leadership in creation of institutions for social change is very crucial. This is due to the fact that the role of leadership is reflected by the actions both positive and/or negative. And that is why more institutions fail than are created.

The existing literature on institution building does not focus on the role of leadership (Esman 1972 and Ganesh 1978, 1979). But the recent study on excellent organizations by Peters and Waterman (1982) in their excellent book titled 'In Search of Excellence' mainly focus on the role of leadership in institution building. Similarly Bennis (1982) in his study of top executives of about 100 organizations very clearly indicates the role of leadership as the most important factor in the success of an organization. Bennis (1982) emphasizes that vision is the most important characteristic of a leader.

During the present century, Gandhi's leadership actions were considered as an example of transforming leadership (Burns 1978, p.19-20). One of the important contributions of the present research on excellence is the attention which it draws to the role of leaders (in various walks of life) in developing organizations around individuals and in catering to their needs for being unique and at the same time in belonging to a group through identification with a purpose which transcends individuals' interest (Burns 1978). Burns' conception of transforming leadership is close to the ideal of the role of leadership in institution building and to the task of pursuit of organizational excellence (Ganesh and Joshi 1983).

Role of leadership in creation and development of various organizations/institutions is not generally understood. This is so because the experiences of institution builders are not well documented. Similarly, there are few
leaders who have vision and who are dreamers. It appears that some people are more equipped mentally to carry the mantle of leadership. But then the question is: Can we equip more people for that? Can we train or develop a leader? No easy answers are available to us.

2.5 Conclusion

After going through two major attempts to evolve a common framework of institution building, many issues remain unanswered:

1. The IB model developed for USAID emerged out of a requirement to formulate criteria to provide aid to developing nations. In other words, it was the need of a decision-making body (USAID) to help themselves in formulating a policy rather than a will to help the institution builders for creating strong institutions for social change.

2. The role of leadership in IB model was not clearly specified, despite the realization that early leadership or a group of leaders and the change of leadership at every stage of the growth of an institution can facilitate meaningful progress but, can also kill the very purpose of the institution.

3. IB theory remains as a perspective rather than as a specific set of guidelines for institution builders to transfer their ideology into meaningful on-going missions.

4. In terms of application the IB model fails to guide IB practitioners in case of change of leadership and thereby change or renewal of mission, which has its tremendous impact on the institution building processes.
5. GPM of IB, though it does not focus the role of leadership in IB, is a meaningful attempt to guide institution builders to understand various stages of growth of an institution as well as important mechanisms associated with important aspects of IB like capability development, innovative thrust and penetration.

Rarely, institution builders follow any prescribed framework or guidelines as decision-making strategy or as a model to build an institution on. It is the vision, attitudes and commitment and how far they can serve the societal needs that ultimately help the institution builders. However, there appears to be a pattern in their stances and actions. This is what is sought to be brought out through this study.

* * * * * * * *