CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

2.1 CONCEPT OF ROLE

2.1.1 General Statement

The examination of literature pertaining to role concept revealed that the concept of role has assumed a key position in the field of culture anthropology, sociology and social psychology. Each discipline has a different frame of reference. The conceptualization of role contemplated by some prominent authorities in each field are discussed in this study.

Lionel J. Neiman and James W. Hughes once remarked that:

The concept of role is at present still rather vague, nebulous, and nondefinitive. Frequently in the literature, the concept is used without any attempt on the assumption being that both writer and reader will achieve an immediate compatible concensus.1

Later in 1957, Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern added that there are many conceptualizations not only of role but also of role conflict

revealed through examination of the degree of role consensus and the resolution of role conflict. They noted that:

... not only had there been little systematic research on role consensus but slight attention had been directed to the theoretical implications of differential degree of consensus on role definition, functioning of social system, the behaviour of individual or the cultural organization of a society.

Among anthropologists, role is treated as an integral part of status, or as a link between culture and social structure. Benedict, for example, said:

No man ever looks at the world with pristine eyes. He sees it edited by a definite set of customs and institutions and ways of thinking. Even in his philosophical probing he can not go behind these stereotypes; his very concept of the true and the false will have reference to his particular traditional customs.

Ralph Linton's *The Study of Man* reflected his great interest in the twin concepts of status and role. As the basis for his explanation of status and role, Linton conceived a "society" composed of three elements: individuals,

---


an organized social system, and esprit de corps. According to Linton, a society functioning on the basis of the reciprocal behavior of individuals and "social system" is the sum total of ideal patterns which control the reciprocal behavior between individuals and between individual and society. And additionally, he also defined "role" as "dynamic aspect of status." That is, when man puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role.

Nadel, an anthropologist, views role as modes of acting "allotted to individuals" by the norm of the society, concerning also with this very allocation and the principles on which it was based. This means that his definition and analysis of role must include, their "basis," the conditions entailing the "future characteristics," as much as these characteristics. To him, role is dynamic or processual, yet not a dynamic part of status as viewed by Linton. In this, Nadel suggested "quasi-role" to be an appropriate term for status. He preferred to think of status, in non-hierarchical sense, a particular set of rights and obligations. Instead of viewing status and role as two sides

5 Ibid., p. 105.
6 Ibid., p. 115.
of the same coin, Nadel inferred that "... status is capable of being elaborated into roles while all roles have a foundation in status."  

Sociologists' studies of roles emphasize interaction. Talcott Parsons\(^9\) considered interactions of individuals as social system of action. To him the objective world is composed of social, physical and cultural objects. A social object is an actor, i.e., ego or alter ego. Physical objects are empirical entities, i.e., means and conditions of action. Cultural objects are symbols or value patterns, i.e., ideas or beliefs.

Kingsley Davis broadened the sociological perspective of role by adding "office" to status. He looked at role as behavior and treated office and status as definers of obligatory behavior of the incumbent. In other words, Davis preferred looking at role in action. He amplified the concept as follows:

How an individual actually performs in a given position, as distinct from how he is supposed to perform, we call his role. ... The term "role" is meaningless without the implication that the individual is trying, or is expected to try, to carry out the minimal requirements of his status. In one sense, the role is the particular way in which a given individual falls short of performing the stipulated patterns. If the individual falls completely short he does not occupy the position at all. The very fact that he does not fall completely

---

\(^8\)Ibid., p. 29.

short is due to the normative elements inherent in the status.

Role theory propounded by Sarbin, a social psychologist, emphasized "self" as the unit of personality. The other two conceptual units included in his role theory was role, the unit of the culture; position, the unit of society. He viewed role as "the result of the interaction between two series of events. The first is the maturation series, the second is the personal-social series. The maturation series of events may be assumed to be fairly constant from culture to culture, the personal-social of events is the major determinant of psychological variation."

Sarbin defined a position as "a system of role expectation." His statement on role expectation also specified variables affecting variations of role enactment in interaction situations. Psychologically considered, positions are cognitive systems of role expectations, products of learning. Role expectations are bidimensional, for every role expectation or other there is a reciprocal role expectation of self. The organized sections of persons, directed toward fulfilling these

---


12Ibid., p. 223.
role expectations, comprise the role. Variation in role enactment is a function of at least three variables:  
1) the validity of role perception (this implies the concurrent or just prior to perception and locating of the position of other and reciprocity of self);  
2) skill in role enactment; and  
3) the current organization of the self—a cognitive structure that exercised a selective effect on role perception and enactment.  

2.1.2 Role Theory  

To achieve the task of an organization, whatever that task may be, requires the combined efforts of a number of people working in a hierarchy of superordinate-subordinate relationships with each other and carrying out varying duties and responsibilities. A significant contribution to an understanding of the nature and operation of the organizational structure is a set of concepts and constructs drawn from role theory, an area of theory bringing together analyses and findings from the fields of Sociology, Anthropology, and Psychology.  
1) **Elements**  

According to role theory, organizations are social  

---  

13Ibid., p. 255.
systems made up of people who occupy various "positions" in vertical (hierarchical) and horizontal relationship to each other. Any given position implies the location of one individual or class of individuals within such a social system. The way people behave in these positions depends partly on how they think they are expected to behave and how others actually expect them to behave. These expectations are called "roles."

A deeper examination of the concept of "role" reveals a number of possible ramifications, as per studies by Griffith. Thus, a "role perception" is a social norm for a role, abstractly defined by the culture. A "role stereotype" is an individual's own personalized perception of a role, which may be largely shared with other people or be idiosyncratic. A "role description" is expected to be a report of behavior actually performed by role incumbents.

Moreover, Griffith held that "role expectation" is an anticipation of a behavior or a set of behaviors of another person in a role, a set of evaluative standards. An expectation may have direction, in that it may be either a prescription or a proscription, and it may have intensity, on a continuum ranging from the permissive through the preferential to mandatory. A "role perception" is an estimate of another person's expectation of one's

---

own role. If the other person is seen as having a right to hold this expectation, it is regarded as "legitimate"; if he is seen as not having such a right, then it is regarded as "illegitimate."15

2) Conflicts

Role theory is useful in clarifying the nature of some of the conflicts within organizations. Role conflict may stem from a number of sources.

One of these is the possible conflict between cultural values and institutions. The secondary-school principal, for instance, may recognize the place of general culture values upon a well-balanced programme of education while feeling distinct pressure from the school board and the community against public display activities by the musical and dramatic organizations and the athletic teams.

Conflicts within roles and between roles are the most common of role conflicts. One kind of conflict occurs when the manner in which a person thinks he is expected to behave (role perception) is different from the manner others really expect him to behave (role expectation). An administrator may think the board of education wants him to refer most problems to it for consideration during meetings.

15 Ibid., p. 132.
while the board really thinks its meetings are too cluttered and wishes the administrator himself to make more decisions.

Another kind of conflict occurs when two reference groups have conflicting expectations of a role incumbent, as when the teachers' association expects the superintendent to press for higher salaries, while the school board expects him to keep the school taxes down. Or there may be conflict among members within a particular reference group concerning their expectations of a role. One group of teachers may expect their principal to be an ideal man and an initiator; but another group may simply want the principal to stay out of their way and be ready to supply the art paper and chalk when needed.

Dalton\textsuperscript{16} proposed a type of conflict in perceptions between incumbents of co-ordinate or related roles. Formal roles always embrace supplemental informal roles, and individuals will vary in their capacity to assume these informal roles, especially in those clashes between formalists and informalists over when and how far to depart from a formal role.

Conflict can occur over the relative saliency accorded to two or more concurrent roles at a given point

\textsuperscript{16}ibid., p. 134.
in time. This is the plight of a married woman teacher who at 4.30 p.m. may be torn between giving further help to a small group of students and going home to cook an early supper for her husband who has an evening meeting.

This brief survey of the conflict of role will serve as a theoretical framework for the study of university role theory—which is the subject of this thesis.

2.2 UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

2.2.1 General Concepts

In its early days, the university had central purpose of providing a rationale for medieval society. It marshalled evidence to support leading church dogmas and to construct theologically-oriented views of man and the world. It trained young men in their skill. Later, with the shift from acceptance of truths handed down by the church to the stress on scientific method as the basis of discovery and accommodation of new knowledge, it had to redefine its purposes to become more in accordance with a society moving toward industrialization. In the Middle Ages as well as in the Age of Enlightenment, universities were the scenes of bitter debates, but these were not usually about goals of the institution. Rather they often dealt with such fine points and shades of difference that those outside the university had difficulty in following
what the argument was all about. But even when debates centered upon some highly controversial topic, they did not divide the community of scholars over the issue of the central purpose of a scholar.

More recently, the purpose of the university has become blurred and the "community of scholars" is at times a figure of speech rather than reality. Structurally, the increase in size and the heavy financial burdens of a modern university have greatly expanded the administrative apparatus. On many campuses there are now conflicts of interests between the administration and the faculty which plays havoc with the cozy ideal of shared sentiment and common values.

A further breakdown in the traditional sense of community is found in the difference between younger and older faculty members: between those who do not have tenure and those who have; and between a minority who feel that the university ought to be involved in social action, in giving direction to the society, and the majority who prefer to play the more conventional professional role. Also, with the shift in the concept of student as an embryonic scholar and an apprentice to the concept that he should be processed through an academic maze of courses and credit hours, the identity of interests between faculty members and most students increases as our society more and more thinks that the chief role of the university is to issue degrees and diplomas in a highly professionalized society. In such a case, the student is not so much interested in knowledge
for its own sake as in getting the diploma or degree which is a prerequisite for getting a professional job.

This utilitarian emphasis is a great departure from what Talcott Parsons calls the "cognitive orientation," or the cultural matrix out of which the present university has evolved. The university's stock-in-trade has been knowledge: the students come to the college or university to gain it, the administrators help the faculty finance research to further it. Many consider the professor's concern to be with the students' mind and according to Edward Shils, he should teach the best knowledge that has been attained by mankind on what are thought to be the most important subjects. Others, like Martin Meyerson, argue that intellectual life includes an affective character as well as a cognitive character—a student's emotions are important as well. How a student feels toward his society and toward the main issues involving mankind is highly significant, along with what he knows about them. Most professors deal with the cognitive aspect and play down emotional overtones. Therefore, to the extent that they are asked to express in their teaching a commitment to some pressing social issue, they become confused about

---


the nature of the university and their own role in it. If the cognitive purpose is denigrated, they begin to lose their sense of community.

Differences in the values of faculty and students are noted by William Lewin, a British professor, who prefers to think of the university as a family run by its mature members rather than a community, which is right for him to see in terms of identity of interests. He comments:

> The demand for democratic universities is absurd...because it assumes that a university is single community in the sense that its members share a common principal goal. In fact, they obviously do not. The goal of most teachers is to work in the university for the rest of their lives; the goal of most students is to get out as soon as possible. A university in England today is not a community; it is rather an institution where two communities meet.20

According to H.C. Dent,21 universities have always been in transition. From the earliest days of these medieval gatherings of scholars out of which they grew, they have never ceased to change. The process of change has been unending because the universities have never failed to respond to the pressures, both internal and external, which

---


have continuously been brought to bear upon them. Sometimes
they have responded willingly; sometimes reluctantly;
sometimes swiftly; sometimes very slowly; but sooner or later
the response has always come. In the course of the
centuries, these responses shaped every element in the spirit,
the life, and the work of universities: ideas, aims, and
functions; government, finance and administration; subjects of
study, and academic standards; professional techniques and
domestic life; relation with state and local authority; with
the church, with other educational institutions; and with
society at large.

Flexner sees the difference between secondary and
university education as one between immaturity and maturity,
and he regards secondary education as involving
responsibilities for the students' way of life and method
of work which are not the concern of the university scholar
and teacher. The difference is largely one of emphasis: at
school the emphasis is on teaching while at a university the
emphasis is on learning. It is the responsibility of the
university student to learn, not the task of the lecturer to
see whether he does so, and this doctrine is not merely a
device to set the university teacher free to have more time
for research. Most university teachers feel that it is better
for the student that he should develop the power of independent

22Abraham Flexner, Universities: American, English, German
study in order that he may continue to study after he has left the university. Another difference between school and university is that at a university the distinction between the teacher and the taught becomes blurred: the university teacher must himself practise the habit of study that he expects of his students.

2.2.2 Objectives and Philosophies

The aim of education in an institution of higher education learning is relative. It depends on what disciplines under which definition is derived. However, in this study it is concerned with the Arts aspect of general education that should be offered on the college or university level as well as with the specialization that may be undertaken. First of all, the following objectives of higher education listed by the American President's Commission on Higher Education23 are worthy of consideration. These are:

1) To develop for the regulation of one's personal and civic life a code of behavior based on ethical principles consistent with democratic ideas;

---

2) To participate actively as an informed and responsible citizen in solving the social, economic and political problems of one's own community, state and nation;

3) To recognize the interdependence of the different peoples of the world and one's personal responsibility for fostering international understanding and peace;

4) To understand the common phenomena in one's physical environment, to apply habits of scientific thought to both personal and civic problems, and to appreciate the implications of scientific discoveries for human welfare;

5) To understand the ideas and to express one's own effectively;

6) To attain a satisfactory emotional and social adjustment;

7) To maintain and improve one's own health and to co-operate actively and intelligently in solving community health problems;

8) To understand and enjoy literature, art, music, and other cultural activities as expression of personal and social experience, and to participate
to some extent in some form of creative activity;

9) To acquire the knowledge and attitudes basic to a satisfying family life;

10) To choose a socially and personally satisfying vocation that will permit one to use to the full his particular interests and abilities;

11) To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking.

The objectives listed above indicated an emphasis on the growth of man through the university education which, of course, relate to the university function as suggested by Courmand and other authorities respectively.

According to Courmand,24 a modern university should include five functions:

1) A depository of all traditional and acquired knowledge;

2) A centre of acquisition of new knowledge, i.e., research;

3) A centre of instruction by tried and experimental

---

methods of pedagogy of humanities and
science which are halves of one whole culture;

4) A centre of development and training for the
present day practice of any number of
professions or technological avocation; and

5) A cultural and civilizing guide for its students
and teachers and also the members of the society
at large.

From Hetherington's contribution one can summarize
the distinctive features of a university as follows:

1) The university is a community of scholars and
students both senior and junior;

2) It is concerned with knowledge, particularly
with the branch of knowledge acquired for the
full exercise of a variety of higher
professional calling—this variety being an
important consideration, since the university
is a meeting place of different disciplines;

3) Its aim is to communicate and advance these
disciplines, its objective being to discover
and better understand truth;

25 Hector Hetherington, "University Organization and
Administration," in Seminar on University Planning and
4) Therefore, its work, cannot be narrowly utilitarian and sectarian in outlook. It is infused with a liberality of spirit, calculated to encourage scholars by mutual enlightenment and criticism, to look to the unity of knowledge, to be aware of its place in the totality of the values of human experience, and thereby to contribute to the education of the "whole man" and to the maintenance and enrichment of the culture within the university.

According to Sir Walter Muirhead, these principles can be summarized as given below:

1) The university is a place where is an agreement, even passionate agreement, on the conviction that the intellectual pursuits are of utmost worth;

2) The university is committed to intellectual thoroughness. It has the fearless courage to

---

follow the truth, however embarrassing may be the outcome to previous convictions and vested interests:

3) The university takes pride in meticulous accuracy in matters of empirical evidence; embracing hypotheses it corroborates and rejecting those it does not;

4) In controversial matters the university plays the part of the judge rather than the advocate. It is impartial but not necessarily neutral;

5) No matter how unpopular the results of its inquiry, the university insists on freedom of inquiry and publication. Indeed, it is so strongly open-minded that paradoxically, it does not have a very open mind about the value of the open-minded; and

6) The university has a responsibility for focusing the issues of the day that can be thrashed out and where nonsense can be exposed for what it is.

In addition, the Report of the Indian Education
Commission 1964-1966 defines the objectives of higher education as under:

1) To seek and cultivate new knowledge, to engage vigorously and fearlessly in the pursuit of truth, and to interpret old knowledge and beliefs in the light of new needs and discoveries;

2) To provide the right kind of leadership in all walks of life, to identify gifted youth and help them to develop their potential to the full by cultivating physical fitness, developing the powers of the mind, and intellectual values;

3) To provide society with competent men and women trained in agriculture, arts, medicine, science and technology, and various other professions, who will also be cultivated individuals imbued with a sense of social purpose;

4) To strive to promote equality and social justice and to reduce social and cultural differences

through the diffusion of education; and

5) To foster in the teachers and students, and through them in society generally, the attitudes and values needed for developing the "good life" in individuals and society.

Whatever has been said so far about the objectives and underlying philosophy of the university education can be summed up in the words of Jawaharlal Nehru taken from his Convocation Address to the University of Allahabad in 1947. According to him:

A university stands for humanism, for tolerance, for reason, for progress. For the adventure of ideas, and for the search for truth. It stands for the onward march of human race towards even higher objectives. If the universities discharge their duty, then it is well for the nation and the people.28

2.2.3 Roles of University

1) Theoretical Role

Looking even more broadly and in a more significant sense, we learn that the university as an academic institution

has been more actively involved in the development process than previously indicated. It can take up the contributions of the university to national development planning by discussing the traditional roles of the academic community, namely teaching, community services and roles of research. Perkins agrees with this idea. According to him the three-fold mission of the university is: i) the acquisition of knowledge through research; ii) the transmission of knowledge through teaching; and iii) the transmission of knowledge through public service.

Koesnadi Hardjacoemantri also expresses a similar view. He writes: "Universities having to fulfill the three prime objectives: teaching, research and service to the society, that is to say, to acquire knowledge, to preserve and transmit this knowledge and to promote the application of this knowledge to the service of the society, all these are expected to promote the development and modernization


of human society. The modern universities are becoming more and more engaged in socio-economic development. They are designed to be development universities."

The role of university in community service was emphasized in the 1969 Convocation Address by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore as follows:

"Like grafted tissues or transplanted organs, universities live or die depending on whether they have a kinship with their social and culture development. Today we can justly take satisfaction by the thought that members of universities are not only teachers or students but are also active participants in Singapore's defence force, diplomatic service, statutory bodies, community centre and other civic organizations, and through their researches are contributing toward Singapore's economic and social development. We seek to expand this public service role, for only by doing so can we justify confidence of the public in the university's capacity for playing a positive role in shaping the destiny and future of the Republic."

The important point is that a university has multiple tasks to perform, which are different from the tasks of other institutions in society. It requires, therefore, its own institutional form and its own organization, and these will be different from those of other institutions and of society itself. The report of

---

31 Ibid., pp. 136-137.
the Committee on Relations with Junior Members is quite explicit on this point:

In our view, no theory of legal or political rights for the conduct of a society as a whole, not even democratic theory, is transferable to these distinctly academic activities (research and teaching). Since these distinctive purposes are to be pursued, it is, we believe, plain that teachers equipped with skill, knowledge and experience, training and continuing professional association with a university should have final authority as to the manner in which they are pursued.32

Rice33 also emphasized that a university, in the present day, is unlikely to be able to isolate itself from its society. No university has sufficient resources of its own to maintain itself or can obtain a sufficient income from fees alone. The private foundations have to receive public support in one form or another—grants for students, research, buildings, or equipment. Because they use public funds, universities have to respond to every need, or that they have to abandon entirely their tradition of scholarship in the interests of immediate contemporary events. Universities are, or should be, enduring institutions transmitting more than the short term values of their society.

33Ibid.
Moreover, universities are related not only to their own societies but to the world of knowledge, to their counterparts in other societies. Rice observes:

Local pressure for local needs, and local constraints, may have to be accepted, but if they dominate a university, the university is unlikely to endure even as a national, let alone an international, institution. And in the terms of quality of its output, I believe, this to be true whether the university is a private, local, state, or national institution.34

2) Practical Role.

It is clear that several are the purposes and tasks of universities. Among them are acquisition of advanced knowledge and mission of research, transmission of advanced knowledge and mission of teaching, and application of advanced knowledge and mission of public service, etc. But it has been stated that most universities, especially in Southeast Asia, are in fact, oriented toward development. That orientation is only too often "lip service."35 In reality, there are probably few cases in which university

34 Ibid., p. 112.

departments have analyzed and reviewed their curriculum carefully in the light of the development requirements or even the social reality of their society.

In Thailand, many questions have been asked about the function and role of a university as to whether it should be limited to the training of civil servants and if so, who should train professionals for the non-governmental sector, and who should cultivate scholars and thinkers? In such a case, what happens to higher education institutions? What roles should universities play in order to meet human needs?

To answer these burning questions concerning the practical role of the universities in the country, the following contentions need to be made at this stage of the study.

TRAINING

Apart from preparing graduates to fulfil manpower requirement, the universities in Thailand have to train people who will be directly involved in the formulation and implementation of development plan. The creation of the Institute of Public Administration (IPA) in Thammasat University in 1958 was one of the first attempts to give the students (who were largely government officials)
exposure to basic administrative principles and techniques needed for carrying out government activities. The underlying concept for creating the National Institution of Development Administration (NIDA), which is an outgrowth of the IPA, is oriented to prepare development administrators for both the public and the private sectors.

The NIDA offers graduate studies in four fields: Public Administration, Development Economics, Business Administration and Applied Statistics. In addition, it has a Research Centre, a Training Centre and a Development Documentation Centre. The Programme in Development Economics offers, among others, courses in general theory of economic development, economic planning and project evaluation, whereas the Programme in Public Administration covers many areas of development administration including performance evaluation. The School of Applied Statistics, apart from offering courses in quantitative techniques extremely useful for development planning such as programming techniques, also includes in its curriculum courses in such applied fields as operation research and demographic analysis. The School of Business Administration designs its programme to train junior managers for the private sectors.

In addition to training given to candidates for
Master's degree, the NIDA has been conducting training programmes for government and private agencies either by its Training Centre or by the various Schools. Some of these training programmes are offered on a regular basis, while others are on an ad hoc basis as demanded by the requesting agencies. Examples of the regular training programmes which should be cited include the Executive Development Programme in Economic Development Planning and Implementation conducted by the School of Development Economics. Recently, the School of Business Administration has conducted the Junior Executive Development Programme for business managers in cooperation with the Thailand Management Association.

As a result of the reorganization of the administrative system recently instituted by the National Executive Council (NEC) which set up the planning and policy offices in practically all government departments, the need for planning capability on the part of the staff of these planning units has become more evident and the NIDA has been requested by the NEC to conduct training programmes for the government planning personnel at all levels—a gigantic task compared with the training programme which the NIDA has been given to map this new assignment in terms of the requirements, resource capability, possible
An important role of the university in the development process is to increase knowledge which has a bearing on the development planning through research. Ideally, the knowledge obtained from research activities should be of a practical nature and should be made available to the planners in due time, and it should be of value in the formulation of development policies and action programmes. The ideal, of course, is difficult to achieve, especially when there is a lack of coordinating effort to set up a priority list specifying the research areas which have the most relevance to the development problems of the country, and when research studies are not accessible or accepted by the potential users. The end result is that the scarce manpower is largely engaged in producing something irrelevant, or something which gets shelved the minute it is published.

In the 1969 academic year, of which the latest data are available, some 720 staff members of 17 per cent of the total full-time staff of all universities and institutions of higher learning were engaged in research.
on some 520 research topics. Of these, 82 research workers were from Kasetsart University working on 61 such technical problems of agriculture as effects of soil and fertilizers for improvement in yield; breeding of fish; forestry research; agricultural economic research; labour utilization in rural areas. In the same year, 117 faculty members of Chulalongkorn University were engaged in conducting research on some 100 research studies, ranging from pathology to politics, while 317 faculty members of Mahidol University were involved in some 420 research studies in the medical field. The staff members of other universities also undertook research projects of some kind. The number of staff members involved in research, the number of research projects and amount of research funds for the 1970 academic year* are shown in Table 5 on the next page.

*Academic year 1970 refers to the period of time from June 1970 to April 1971.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>No. of Research Topics</th>
<th>No. of Staff Members Involved</th>
<th>Amount of Funds (in bahts*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahidol Univ.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1,192,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chulalongkorn Univ.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>746,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1,022,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasetsart Univ.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,198,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai Univ.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>118,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srinakharinwirot Univ.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khonkaen Univ.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silpakorn Univ.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thammasat Univ.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>4,647,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of the National Education Council, Bangkok.*

*20 bahts = 1 U.S. dollar.*
Apart from training and research activities, university staff members are also engaged in consultancy services. Staff consulting in development planning has been quite limited, but is increasing as a result of the recent establishment of planning units in operating ministries. The NIDA staff members have been offering consultancy services in the area of regional planning. Now a large number of the NIDA staff is assisting in various planning activities launched by the Ministry of Interior and the newly-founded Bangkok Metropolis government. The arrangement is still largely informal: staff members, through personal contacts, are requested to sit in working groups and on committees on different aspects of planning work on a part-time basis. So far the consultancy services have been offered free of charge, but arrangements are being made to give the outside personnel some remuneration.